

EXHIBIT B

Page 1

1 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2 FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

3 _____
4 DATACORE SOFTWARE CORPORATION,

5 Plaintiff,

6 v. C.A. No.

7 SCALE COMPUTING, INC., 22-535-GBW-SRF

8 Defendant.
9 _____

10 VIDEOCONFERENCE HEARING

11 DATE: Wednesday, November 29, 2023

12 TIME: 12:11 p.m.

13 BEFORE: Honorable Sherry Fallon

14 LOCATION: J. Caleb Boggs Federal Building
15 844 North King Street

16 Unit 14, Room 6100

17 Wilmington, DE 19801

18 REPORTED BY: Andrew Weader

19 JOB NO.: 6322712

20

21

22

23

24

Page 2	Page 4
1 APPEARANCES	1 EXHIBITS
2 ON BEHALF OF PLAINTIFF DATACORE SOFTWARE CORPORATION:	2 NO. DESCRIPTION ID/EVD
3 JODI BENASSI, ESQUIRE (by videoconference)	3 Plaintiff:
4 ETHAN TOWNSEND, ESQUIRE (by videoconference)	4 (None marked.)
5 McDermott Will & Emery, LLP	5
6 415 Mission Street, Suite 5600	6 NO. DESCRIPTION ID/EVD
7 San Francisco, CA 94105	7 Defendant:
8 jbenassi@mwe.com	8 (None marked.)
9 (628) 577-0107	9
10	10
11 ON BEHALF OF DEFENDANT SCALE COMPUTING, INC.:	11
12 TALIN GORDINA, ESQUIRE (by videoconference)	12
13 Wilson Sonsini Goodrich & Rosati, P.C.	13
14 1900 Avenue of the Stars, 28th Floor	14
15 Los Angeles, CA 90067	15
16 (323) 210-2925	16
17 (424) 446-6900	17
18	18
19	19
20	20
21	21
22	22
23	23
24	24
Page 3	Page 5
1 APPEARANCES (Cont'd)	1 PROCEEDINGS
2 ON BEHALF OF DEFENDANT SCALE COMPUTING, INC.:	2 THE COURT: All right. This is the
3 BINDU PALAPURA, ESQUIRE (by videoconference)	3 matter in Datacore vs. Scale. It's docket number
4 Potter Anderson & Corroon, LLP	4 22-535. It's the time that that the Court has set
5 Hercules Plaza	5 aside for a discovery dispute teleconference.
6 1313 North Market Street, 6th Floor	6 Since we're off to a bit of a late
7 Wilmington, DE 19801	7 start, Counsel will need to condense their arguments.
8 bpalapura@potteranderson.com	8 I had set aside an hour for this teleconference, so I
9 (302) 984-6000	9 expect to be concluded by one so that I can attend to
10	10 other matters on the Court calendar.
11	11 With that, let's start with appearances
12	12 of counsel. First, for the plaintiff, Datacore.
13	13 MR. TOWNSEND: Good afternoon, Your
14	14 Honor. This is Ethan Townsend from the Delaware
15	15 office of McDermott Will & Emery on behalf of the
16	16 plaintiff. With me on the line is my colleague from
17	17 San Francisco, Jodi Benassi. Ms. Benassi will be
18	18 presenting to the Court today with the Court's
19	19 permission.
20	20 THE COURT: Very well. Thank you.
21	21 And who was on the line for Scale
22	22 Computing? I know Ms. Palapura is. If you'd like to
23	23 introduce the others on the line, you may do so now.
24	24 MS. PALAPURA: Good afternoon, Your

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 6</p> <p>1 Honor. Bindu Palapura from Potter on behalf of 2 Defendant Scale. And with me today is Talin Gordina 3 from Wilson Sonsini Goodrich & Rosati. Ms. Gordina is 4 going to be handling the arguments this afternoon.</p> <p>5 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you for that.</p> <p>6 I have read the materials that have 7 been submitted and I am prepared to go forward. And I 8 think, Counsel, I think there were two issues that 9 have been resolved prior to today's conference. We'll 10 go forward, unless I hear otherwise that said other 11 issues have been resolved, we'll go forward with 12 Datacore's Motion to Compel --</p> <p>13 I'd like to start with the Motion for 14 Relief in the form of precluding Scale from relying on 15 documents produced after the document discovery 16 deadline of August 31.</p> <p>17 And specifically, I'd like to hear from 18 Datacore how weighing the Pennypack factors tips in 19 favor of this substantial relief that Datacore is 20 seeking.</p> <p>21 MS. BENASSI: Thank you, Your Honor. 22 This is Jodi Benassi from McDermott Will & Emery for 23 the plaintiff.</p> <p>24 Your Honor, Scale has been operating on</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 8</p> <p>1 And also I want the date on which you 2 served your 30(b)(6) Deposition Notice on behalf of 3 Datacore. I didn't see the date mentioned and I 4 didn't look that closely at the docket to find it.</p> <p>5 MS. BENASSI: Sure, Your Honor. I'd be 6 happy to provide that. The date that we provided the 7 Deposition Notice was on July 27, 2023.</p> <p>8 And with respect to Scale's document 9 production for clarity, they produced 151,074 10 documents in productions between June 1 and the close 11 of fact discovery. So that was after the deadline for 12 substantial document completion and close of fact 13 discovery. Prior to June 1, they had produced 499 14 documents. After close of fact discovery on August 15 31st, they produced an additional 5,127 documents.</p> <p>16 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. So your 17 30(b)(6) notice was issued in July, roughly a little 18 over a month before the close of fact discovery, is 19 that correct?</p> <p>20 MS. BENASSI: That's correct.</p> <p>21 THE COURT: And then the bulk of these 22 documents came in as of September 18th, albeit if a 23 portion, a significant portion of them, were untimely 24 in Datacore's view. Is that right?</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 7</p> <p>1 its own discovery timeline in this case and has 2 completely ignored this Court's schedule and the 3 rules. They've made 12 document productions past the 4 deadlines in the scheduling order, and these 5 productions have represented over 99 percent of their 6 total documents produced in this case.</p> <p>7 Datacore has been harmed by these 8 untimely productions. First, Datacore did not have an 9 opportunity to review and analyze the bulk of Scale's 10 documents before it served its 30(b)(6) Deposition 11 Notice on Scale. And second, Datacore was unable --</p> <p>12 THE COURT: Let me interrupt there.</p> <p>13 And I'm sorry, I know it's difficult on these calls. 14 But I want to make sure I'm precisely understanding 15 your argument, because I'm hearing a different story 16 from Scale. I'm sure you've read their response.</p> <p>17 When you say that this is 99 percent of 18 their production was belated, they're telling me that, 19 you know, slightly over 5,100 documents were produced, 20 I guess, between the document production deadline and 21 September 18. And then a few more came in in November 22 after I ruled on one of the prior discovery disputes. 23 You're telling me 99 percent of their document 24 production is a belated or late untimely production?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 9</p> <p>1 MS. BENASSI: That's correct. And just 2 to be clear again, the biggest production, which was 3 137,172 documents, which equated to 267,466 pages, 4 occurred on August 19, which was 10 days before the 5 close of fact discovery. No other production had been 6 near that size. And then it was in September that 7 we --</p> <p>8 THE COURT: So let me stop you there. 9 Maybe easier to get through since we have limited time 10 on this call. So you nonetheless had, I'll call it, a 11 document dump for purposes of our discussion, in 12 August, like, 10 days or so before the close of fact 13 discovery. And at that time, the 30(b)(6) Deposition 14 Notice had already issued, correct?</p> <p>15 MS. BENASSI: That's correct.</p> <p>16 THE COURT: And adjustments had to be 17 made in light of wrapping in those documents that were 18 produced on the eve of fact discovery closing if they 19 were going to be useful in this 30(b)(6) deposition 20 and/or other fact witness depositions. Is that right?</p> <p>21 MS. BENASSI: That's right, Your Honor. 22 And we had at the time all of Scale's 30(b)(6) 23 depositions scheduled to happen in September, so we 24 were scrambling.</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 10</p> <p>1 THE COURT: Then the parties did make 2 adjustments to push them out to November. And it's my 3 understanding one of the reasons it was pushed out by 4 two months at that time was because Datacore's legal 5 team had other unrelated matters and/or trials that it 6 was preoccupied with and could not push these 7 depositions out by just a month. Is that right?</p> <p>8 MS. BENASSI: That's correct. But I'll 9 point out a nuance to that. In August and through the 10 beginning of September, the parties were moving 11 forward with us taking Scale's 30(b)(6) depositions in 12 September. And so we were working through those 13 documents as quickly as we could.</p> <p>14 And then the two subsequent productions 15 happened without any warning at all. And you know, 16 that was almost 30,000 documents that got produced. 17 Actually, it was over 30,000.</p> <p>18 And so it wasn't until after September 19 18th that we had asked Scale for second depositions of 20 their witnesses, and they refused. And we had no 21 alternative at that point but to agree to move the 22 depositions to November.</p> <p>23 And you're correct, through the month 24 of October, Datacore's lead counsel in the case was at</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 12</p> <p>1 the other witnesses since the time that the 2 depositions were taken earlier in the month and has 3 had the ability to go through those, except for this 4 one that's being taken tomorrow, correct?</p> <p>5 MS. BENASSI: He has copies. Our 6 experts have copies of all of the transcripts, 7 correct.</p> <p>8 THE COURT: And there's nothing 9 specific in your letter briefing, unless I've 10 overlooked it. And if I have, please feel free to 11 correct me. I don't presume to have all of these 12 arguments in every line in the letter briefing 13 committed to memory. But I didn't see anything in the 14 letter briefing about how your expert is hindered in 15 any way shape or form from producing an opening report 16 within the deadline set currently by this current 17 scheduling order.</p> <p>18 MS. BENASSI: Well, Your Honor, one of 19 the issues is Datacore has not had the time to analyze 20 the over 5,000 documents that have been produced by 21 Scale after the close of fact discovery. So we don't 22 know the extent of what's in those documents. So that 23 has severely prejudiced Datacore.</p> <p>24 And then in turn, the fact that we</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 11</p> <p>1 trial in another matter.</p> <p>2 And so all of the depositions in this 3 case have happened in November, which has further 4 prejudiced Datacore's expert's ability to write their 5 expert reports, which are due next Friday.</p> <p>6 So our last deposition is happening 7 tomorrow, and then there's eight days until our expert 8 reports are due. And having everything happening in 9 November has really prejudiced Datacore.</p> <p>10 THE COURT: Well, after reviewing the 11 documents, you didn't go back and amend your 30(b)(6) 12 Deposition Notice before proceeding with the bulk of 13 these fact depositions in November, correct?</p> <p>14 MS. BENASSI: Correct.</p> <p>15 THE COURT: You have essentially taken 16 all the depositions, all the fact depositions that 17 needed to be taken within this timeframe except for 18 one. There's one final one that you say is going 19 forward did you say tomorrow, is that right?</p> <p>20 MS. BENASSI: That's correct, Your 21 Honor. There's an additional fact witness who's being 22 deposed tomorrow.</p> <p>23 THE COURT: All right. So your expert 24 theoretically then has all these transcripts of all</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 13</p> <p>1 haven't had a chance to review all of those documents 2 prejudices Datacore's experts.</p> <p>3 THE COURT: Yeah, but you're not 4 showing -- I mean, you're making an argument in 5 conclusory terms that there's prejudice, but you're 6 not showing me how. The parties have adjusted.</p> <p>7 And let me preface this by saying, you 8 know, and I'll discuss this with Scale, that the Court 9 disfavors document dumps that are made either on the 10 eve of discovery closing or belatedly shortly 11 thereafter. That is not the way discovery should be 12 handled in the case.</p> <p>13 Nonetheless, when looking at the 14 Pennypack factors, it's not a black and white all or 15 nothing result. It doesn't automatically result in a 16 preclusion. The document dump is only one part of the 17 analysis. In analyzing prejudice, prejudice has to be 18 shown.</p> <p>19 I need to see just exactly where the 20 prejudice is and how mitigating or attempting to cure 21 that prejudice is going to have a domino effect in 22 terms of upending the rest of the case, in terms of 23 the schedule and going forward with it.</p> <p>24 And that's not in this letter briefing</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 14</p> <p>1 record unless I'm missing it. Can you show me where 2 that is?</p> <p>3 MS. BENASSI: Not at the moment. But 4 what I can say in terms of prejudice that I think is 5 throughout the letter brief is that we, Datacore, has 6 not had an opportunity to analyze the 5,100 documents. 7 And because of that, we weren't able to ask Scale's 8 witnesses questions about those 5,100 documents.</p> <p>9 I mean, there's certain documents we 10 were able to get to, but we couldn't get through 11 everything. And that's the prejudice here.</p> <p>12 THE COURT: You've had 5,100 documents, 13 as I understand it, since September 18th, well over 14 two months now. Am I mistaken?</p> <p>15 MS. BENASSI: No, you're correct in 16 terms of the timing, but it's the nuances, what's 17 happened in terms of the timing.</p> <p>18 So in the month of September, we were 19 ramped up in August with the full discovery team to 20 review documents and getting ready for depositions in 21 September. That team wound down.</p> <p>22 And so we're in the middle of preparing 23 for all of these depositions, preparing our witnesses, 24 preparing deposition outlines, and then we get two</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 16</p> <p>1 We think we'll have time to go through 2 and identify any issues in the documents. And I think 3 potentially we could take a deposition before the 4 rebuttal report. That might be possible.</p> <p>5 THE COURT: What deposition are you 6 envisioning taking before the rebuttal expert report?</p> <p>7 MS. BENASSI: We don't know because we 8 don't know what's in the documents.</p> <p>9 THE COURT: All right. Well, that 10 explains the -- and I think I don't need to ask my 11 next question. Which is, what is the scope, topics, 12 timeframe, and amount of time needed for this related 13 relief of seeking an additional 30(b)(6) deposition? 14 You're not in a position I'm assuming to respond to 15 that inquiry?</p> <p>16 MS. BENASSI: That's correct, Your 17 Honor.</p> <p>18 THE COURT: All right. Anything 19 further before I hear from Scale on this issue?</p> <p>20 MS. BENASSI: I would -- no, given the 21 time, I'll rest on that.</p> <p>22 THE COURT: Very well. Thank you. 23 Ms. Gordina, I'll hear from you on 24 behalf of Scale.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 15</p> <p>1 additional document productions.</p> <p>2 We didn't have time to turn to those 3 documents and fully analyze them by the time we were 4 getting ready for the 30(b)(6) depositions that were 5 happening in September.</p> <p>6 Then in October, the core team left, 7 went off to another trial and didn't come back until 8 November. By the time November hit, it was 9 back-to-back depositions. Every single day 10 practically in the month of November has been a 11 deposition.</p> <p>12 So either we're taking a deposition or 13 we've been preparing our witnesses for depositions, 14 there's been zero time to go back and review the 15 documents.</p> <p>16 THE COURT: Have you thought about some 17 interim remedy short of precluding the use of these 18 documents throughout the remainder of the litigation?</p> <p>19 MS. BENASSI: We have, Your Honor. We 20 thought about that in advance of today's hearing. And 21 you know, we think, you know, if we were given until, 22 let's say, you know, a week or so after the rebuttal 23 reports. And our rebuttal reports right now are due 24 on January 15th, maybe a week or two before that.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 17</p> <p>1 MS. GORDINA: Good afternoon, Your 2 Honor. Thank you for the opportunity.</p> <p>3 Your Honor, you focused in on the key 4 issue here, which is the prejudice. There is none, 5 because as the record reflects, these 5,000 or so 6 documents have been in the possession of Datacore for 7 over two months.</p> <p>8 And based on their own representations 9 to us about the contents of those documents, it seemed 10 to us that they had reviewed them, and they asked 11 questions about those documents of our witnesses at 12 their depositions in November.</p> <p>13 So Ms. Benassi's representation that 14 they have not reviewed those 5,000 documents in the 15 last two, two plus months, it's surprising because it 16 contradicts what the record shows to us.</p> <p>17 We are not prepared to discuss another 18 30(b)(6) deposition after the rebuttal report. This 19 is the first time Datacore's Counsel has raised that 20 issue. So we have not met and conferred about that. 21 But it's difficult to see how that would remedy 22 anything here when there is no prejudice.</p> <p>23 It's important to also understand what 24 those documents are. In the course of preparing our</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 18</p> <p>1 witnesses for their depositions, we identified these 2 documents that had been withheld because of privilege. 3 We realized that they were inadvertently withheld. We 4 had our reviewers look through them again and we 5 believed that the right thing to do was to produce 6 them as soon as we understood that they had been 7 inadvertently withheld. So we produced them within 8 about two weeks of the close of fact discovery.</p> <p>9 Ms. Benassi failed to mention that 10 Datacore produced 90 percent of their documents within 11 the last 10 days of the fact discovery period. By the 12 June 1st substantial completion deadline, Datacore had 13 produced less than 70 documents.</p> <p>14 So the discussion of what occurred 15 prior to the close of fact discovery, that seems a 16 little bit of an unrelated or tangential discussion 17 here, that I think the focus really needs to be on 18 these 5,000 documents. A few hundred of which were 19 documents that Datacore already had. These were 20 emails between the parties.</p> <p>21 So as you said, it's hard to see where 22 there is any prejudice when Datacore has had these 23 documents for over two months, has reviewed them, and 24 has even questioned our witnesses about those</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 20</p> <p>1 Did you give them any assistance with 2 that in terms of what you were producing, why you were 3 producing it late, how you were producing it, maybe on 4 a rolling basis to ease the burden of going through 5 it? Can you tell me what you did to assist them in 6 light of the fact that you're dumping 5,100 documents 7 on them at a very inopportune time in the litigation?</p> <p>8 MS. GORDINA: Your Honor, we did do it 9 on a rolling basis. There were two productions, one 10 on September 13th and one on September 18th.</p> <p>11 In terms of a notification, my 12 understanding there was no email notifying them that 13 this was coming. As soon as we realized what had 14 happened, we were busy reviewing the documents, making 15 sure that our vendor was getting them ready for 16 production. So the answer is we didn't provide them 17 any notice, but the production was made on a rolling 18 basis. Half of it came on the 13th and about just 19 over half of it on the 18th.</p> <p>20 In terms of the -- well, I'll stop 21 there. I just wanted to answer your question.</p> <p>22 THE COURT: All right. And in terms of 23 the interim relief that they suggested, that once 24 they're fully able to absorb and review all of these</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 19</p> <p>1 documents at their deposition.</p> <p>2 So the extreme sanction of excluding 3 these documents, we don't see how that can be 4 warranted by the balancing of the Pennypack factors 5 when there's clearly no prejudice to Datacore.</p> <p>6 I'll stop there, Your Honor, and see if 7 you have any questions just in interest of time.</p> <p>8 THE COURT: Thank you, but I don't have 9 anything additional at this time.</p> <p>10 Except that, well, let me just ask.</p> <p>11 You said of those 5,100 or so documents that were 12 produced, and they were produced late because some of 13 them were thought to be privileged, you know, I guess 14 I'm finding it difficult to understand that. I mean, 15 the parties have been in this litigation for some 16 time. And I'm sure your team is well aware, not just 17 in this litigation, but in all cases like this, 18 similar to this, the Court disfavors document dumps.</p> <p>19 How were these produced? Were they 20 produced all at once, were they produced on a rolling 21 basis? Did you have any discussion giving Datacore a 22 heads up that these were coming and to assist them 23 with the rather large task of going through what is 24 essentially a document dump at an inopportune time?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 21</p> <p>1 documents, and if it is determined that it would be 2 helpful to have an additional 30(b)(6) deposition, and 3 they propose doing it before rebuttal expert reports 4 are due, what is Scale's position on that other 5 alternative form of relief?</p> <p>6 MS. GORDINA: Well, Your Honor, again, 7 it's the first time we're hearing this, and we don't 8 have enough details about what Datacore is 9 contemplating in terms of who the witnesses are or 10 what the questioning will be.</p> <p>11 I think the problem there is having a 12 deposition in the middle of expert reports can sort of 13 upset the schedule as well. It may have impacts on 14 previously served expert reports.</p> <p>15 So it's hard to imagine what that will 16 look like without knowing more, about specifically 17 what Datacore is hoping to get out of that deposition 18 that they have not already gotten out of. They've 19 deposited 10 Scale witnesses by the end of this month. 20 And so it's unclear what in those 5,000 documents they 21 believe they still need to question our witnesses on.</p> <p>22 As we mentioned in our opposition 23 letter, they have actually asked questions of our 24 30(b)(6) witnesses about those documents. And it's,</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 22</p> <p>1 again, what I'm hearing Ms. Benassi say today is 2 contradicted by the record. The fact that they 3 allegedly haven't reviewed the documents is 4 contradicted by the fact that they've questioned our 5 witnesses about those documents.</p> <p>6 So unfortunately, I don't have enough 7 information from Ms. Benassi about the remedy she's 8 seeking to be able to intelligently comment on it at 9 this time.</p> <p>10 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. 11 Anything further before I hear final words from 12 Datacore on this issue?</p> <p>13 MS. GORDINA: No, Your Honor.</p> <p>14 THE COURT: All right. Ms. Benassi?</p> <p>15 MS. BENASSI: Thank you, Your Honor. 16 First, just to clear the record, I had previously said 17 that we had not reviewed all of the 5,100 documents. 18 There are some that we were able to review and 19 question witnesses on, but we have not been able to 20 review all of them.</p> <p>21 Second, and importantly, the argument 22 about privileged documents is the first time in the 23 letter that Scale has made such an argument, and it's 24 implausible for three reasons.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 24</p> <p>1 factors do not weigh in favor of that extreme relief, 2 and that Datacore on this record has not carried its 3 burden of showing that the Pennypack factors weigh in 4 favor of relief.</p> <p>5 As I said earlier on the call, the 6 Court certainly disfavors document dumps on the eve of 7 a discovery cut off or belatedly afterwards. But the 8 remedies in each case are case specific, and Datacore 9 hasn't carried its burden of demonstrating that the 10 extreme relief of precluding the documents from being 11 utilized is warranted here, and has in fact indicated 12 that, you know, an interim remedy might be 13 appropriate.</p> <p>14 But again, the Court is not in a 15 position to grant the interim remedy, because the 16 contours of that have not been developed. And 17 Datacore needs to complete its review of those 18 documents.</p> <p>19 You've had them in hand now since 20 mid-September. And I recognize, and I'm not faulting 21 the plaintiff for not getting through them as 22 expeditiously as perhaps, you know, you'd hope to 23 given the press of other matters.</p> <p>24 But that's the nature of litigation.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 23</p> <p>1 First, during the parties' meet and 2 confer on October 26th, we asked Scale why they 3 produce such a large volume of documents after fact 4 discovery closed, and Scale stated that they went back 5 to look for more information and realized that there 6 were more documents to produce. There was no 7 information about privilege. We also asked them why 8 they didn't give us a heads up, and they did not 9 really provide us with an answer to that.</p> <p>10 Second, when we looked at the documents 11 at a high level, many of those documents appear to be 12 industry publications and advertisements and press 13 releases that are clearly not privileged.</p> <p>14 And third, Scale has not stated that it 15 withheld any documents on the basis of privilege. So 16 none of the 5,122 documents were identified as 17 privileged. And that's -- yeah, thank you.</p> <p>18 THE COURT: Okay. All right. Well, we 19 need to move on to the other issues.</p> <p>20 On this issue, the Court denies the 21 Motion to Compel the extreme relief of precluding 22 Scale from relying on documents produced after the 23 August 31, 2023, discovery cut off.</p> <p>24 In summary, I find that the Pennypack</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 25</p> <p>1 Litigation teams are spread thin, they're spread thin 2 with this case, with other non-related cases. But 3 that's the nature of all litigation. And the effort 4 here should be on getting through that document 5 production and coming back to the Court if needed to 6 seek additional relief that is specifically contoured 7 around the documents produced in that belated 8 production.</p> <p>9 In other words, after Datacore gets 10 through these documents, if it feels that there's a 11 necessity to seek another 30(b)(6) deposition of one 12 of Scale's witnesses, that's not a free pass to, you 13 know, button up all loose ends that exist at that 14 time. You know, the relief has to be tailored to the 15 problem. The problem here is a belated document dump 16 after the August 31 cut off. So the relief has to be 17 tailored to that.</p> <p>18 If you're going to seek another 19 30(b)(6) witness, and I'm not saying on this record 20 that the Court would grant it, because at this point, 21 I know nothing about what the scope of that is, what 22 the topics are, what the length, how many hours might 23 be needed with that witness, and within what time 24 range it could be accomplished so as not to disrupt</p>

<p>1 the balance of the crawl [ph] schedule.</p> <p>2 So I'm not saying I would grant that</p> <p>3 release if it was requested. I'm just saying it's</p> <p>4 without prejudice to Datacore to seek further relief.</p> <p>5 But it's got to be tethered to the specific documents</p> <p>6 that came belatedly after the August 31 cut off and is</p> <p>7 not free rein to tie up all loose ends generally in</p> <p>8 the case. It's not another shot at another deposition</p> <p>9 that's all encompassing. So let me be clear on that.</p> <p>10 With that, I am ready to move on to</p> <p>11 Datacore's next topic, which is the Motion to Compel</p> <p>12 Production of Relevant Design and Development</p> <p>13 Documents. I guess I dealt with a similar issue</p> <p>14 previously. We did not have a teleconference, but I</p> <p>15 disposed of it on the papers by oral order. And</p> <p>16 apparently this issue still lingers.</p> <p>17 So let me hear from Datacore on</p> <p>18 compelling production of relevant design and</p> <p>19 development documents.</p> <p>20 MS. BENASSI: Thank you, Your Honor.</p> <p>21 The issue here is the design and development documents</p> <p>22 relating to the accused products. This is a patent</p> <p>23 case, and they have just simply not provided</p> <p>24 sufficient documents in discovery.</p>	<p>Page 26</p> <p>1 testimony that [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]</p> <p>7 How do you respond to that argument?</p> <p>8 MS. BENASSI: Sure. Well,</p> <p>9 Mr. Loughmiller did testify that there are requirement</p> <p>10 documents in the code. And we've repeatedly asked for</p> <p>11 those documents.</p> <p>12 And the source code, for example, our</p> <p>13 expert went out to review the source code, but he</p> <p>14 didn't even have sufficient information from the</p> <p>15 documentation that Scale produced to perform any</p> <p>16 meaningful review of Scale's software. He inspected</p> <p>17 the source code for documents that Scale had told us</p> <p>18 were on the machine, and he wasn't able to locate</p> <p>19 them.</p> <p>20 And here we have Mr. Loughmiller</p> <p>21 stating that there's documents again in the code, but</p> <p>22 we have not seen those.</p> <p>23 THE COURT: Well, to the extent</p> <p>24 Mr. Alexander didn't find those documents at the</p>
<p>1 Our expert stated as part of our letter</p> <p>2 brief that she has not found design and development</p> <p>3 documents to inform him as an engineer how to</p> <p>4 understand the software. The documents that Scale</p> <p>5 produced are written for users, and design documents</p> <p>6 are written for engineers and provide details about</p> <p>7 how the software actually functions.</p> <p>8 During our deposition of</p> <p>9 Mr. Loughmiller, he testified that there are</p> <p>10 requirement documents in the code. Several of Scale's</p> <p>11 witnesses have testified that the company's documents</p> <p>12 are maintained in Salesforce. So we don't think it</p> <p>13 should be difficult for Scale to find and produce</p> <p>14 these documents.</p> <p>15 Mr. Hsieh also testified that there</p> <p>16 might be design documents, but he didn't know where</p> <p>17 they would be. He also referred to another person as</p> <p>18 the main designer of the Scribe product. So he may</p> <p>19 not be the right person to know where these documents</p> <p>20 would be located.</p> <p>21 THE COURT: Okay. A couple of</p> <p>22 questions before I hear from Scale. Scale points out</p> <p>23 that, I guess perhaps you're misinterpreting or</p> <p>24 reading too much into Mr. Loughmiller's deposition</p>	<p>Page 27</p> <p>1 source code review he attended, it was my</p> <p>2 understanding that if they were missing, that Scale</p> <p>3 subsequently put them on the computer. But</p> <p>4 Mr. Alexander, your expert, never went back and looked</p> <p>5 at them. Is that the case?</p> <p>6 MS. BENASSI: No. It was actually a</p> <p>7 different piece of software. So there's three pieces</p> <p>8 of software that are at issue in the litigation. And</p> <p>9 when Mr. Alexander went to their office the first</p> <p>10 time, only one of the three pieces of software source</p> <p>11 code was on the machine. And then they</p> <p>12 stopped -- put --</p> <p>13 THE COURT: That's Scribe, and they put</p> <p>14 HyperCore and Fleet Manager on it, is that --</p> <p>15 MS. BENASSI: That's right, Your Honor.</p> <p>16 THE COURT: Okay. But they then put</p> <p>17 those two additional accused product software on the</p> <p>18 source code computer, and your expert didn't go back</p> <p>19 and look at that. That's what I'm trying to ferret</p> <p>20 out here.</p> <p>21 MS. BENASSI: Yeah. No, that's right.</p> <p>22 He did not go back because he needed to have the</p> <p>23 documentation to understand how the source code was</p> <p>24 structured to have a meaningful review of the source</p>

<p>1 code. And he never --</p> <p>2 THE COURT: [REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED] It's, you</p> <p>4 know, not just Mr. Loughmiller, but I guess the Scale</p> <p>5 senior architect, you pronounce his name Hank Hsieh if</p> <p>6 I understand, testified that the team would discuss a</p> <p>7 plan and then break out individually to code</p> <p>8 components.</p> <p>9 So there was no one specific person</p> <p>10 tasked with documenting the design and development</p> <p>11 process. The, you know, the developers, the writers</p> <p>12 and code writers or wherever each had a component part</p> <p>13 that they were coming up with. And while you're</p> <p>14 looking for something that's neatly packaged up as</p> <p>15 design and development, [REDACTED] from what</p> <p>16 I'm hearing from Scale. And my description of it is</p> <p>17 certainly less sophisticated and scientific than I'm</p> <p>18 sure I'll hear from them when they get the floor.</p> <p>19 But it's my understanding very</p> <p>20 generally and simplistically that the form and format</p> <p>21 of what you're looking for [REDACTED] And that's</p> <p>22 not your understanding on behalf of Datacore?</p> <p>23 MS. BENASSI: That's correct, Your</p> <p>24 Honor. And I would only point out that during</p>	<p>Page 30</p> <p>1 [REDACTED]</p> <p>2 Is there anything further that you can</p> <p>3 point to that you believe supports the fact that [REDACTED]</p> <p>5 MS. BENASSI: The last thing I would</p> <p>6 point to, Your Honor, is the temporal limitation. We</p> <p>7 had asked Scale if they had gone back and looked for</p> <p>8 documents around the time the product was designed,</p> <p>9 which is in 2012. This is a patent case, and the</p> <p>10 patent in this case was filed in 2002, and the accused</p> <p>11 products were designed around 2012.</p> <p>12 And they produced a couple of</p> <p>13 additional documents, but then noted the default</p> <p>14 standard limiting discovery to the past six years.</p> <p>15 And I just want to point out that even</p> <p>16 if the default standard limits discovery to the past</p> <p>17 six years, Scale's using it as a sword and a shield.</p> <p>18 They've asked Datacore for its complete set of</p> <p>19 financials from 1998. And we've agreed to produce</p> <p>20 those. Where here on the other hand, they state to us</p> <p>21 that they don't need to produce documents past six</p> <p>22 years.</p> <p>23 So I don't know if the review and</p> <p>24 looking and investigation into design documents was</p>
<p>1 Mr. Hsieh's deposition, I asked him, do you keep</p> <p>2 design documents related to Scribe? And his response</p> <p>3 was, I don't know where they would be, but I believe</p> <p>4 there might be some out there, because there's been</p> <p>5 talks in the past and I don't know where those would</p> <p>6 be.</p> <p>7 And I asked him if he had seen those</p> <p>8 documents, and he said he just remembered talks, but</p> <p>9 he believed that there were documents. So there's a</p> <p>10 bit of contradiction in his testimony.</p> <p>11 THE COURT: Well, he doesn't remember</p> <p>12 documents, he remembers talks, which is essentially</p> <p>13 what Scale has argued in their response, that reason</p> <p>14 exists. I mean, things were done, I guess [REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED], but that's kind of where we are now. [REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>19 But what you're describing from</p> <p>20 Mr. Hsieh's testimony doesn't confirm that [REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p>	<p>Page 31</p> <p>1 limited by Scale to 2016 or if they truly went back to</p> <p>2 see if there were designed documents around the time</p> <p>3 the accused products would have actually been</p> <p>4 designed.</p> <p>5 THE COURT: Well, the default standard</p> <p>6 is there for a reason, and it's not set aside just</p> <p>7 because a party wants it in discovery. There's a good</p> <p>8 cause standard. What's the good cause for making them</p> <p>9 search for documents beyond the six years in the</p> <p>10 default standard?</p> <p>11 MS. BENASSI: Well, again, Your Honor,</p> <p>12 it's a patent case and the accused products were</p> <p>13 designed in 2012, and the patent was filed in 2002.</p> <p>14 And the design of the document is important for</p> <p>15 Datacore to be able to fully analyze its infringement</p> <p>16 contentions and claims.</p> <p>17 THE COURT: If that were the standard</p> <p>18 for good cause, then there would be no need for a</p> <p>19 six-year limit limitation in the default standard,</p> <p>20 because the same could be said in every patent case.</p> <p>21 So is there anything further that you can point to for</p> <p>22 good cause?</p> <p>23 MS. BENASSI: Not right now, Your</p> <p>24 Honor.</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 34</p> <p>1 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. 2 I'll hear from Scale on this issue.</p> <p>3 And Scale, can you specifically address 4 an argument that was made in Datacore's brief, but I 5 didn't really see you hit it on the head directly in 6 the responsive letter briefing. And that is that 7 Datacore argues that responsive documents reside in 8 Scale's Salesforce database, and Datacore wants the 9 responsive documents specifically related to Scribe, 10 HyperCore, Fleet Manager, HC3 System, and FC Platform, 11 which are needed for its experts to analyze 12 infringement. I need a response directly to that, 13 please.</p> <p>14 MS. GORDINA: Your Honor, with respect 15 to Salesforce, that is a sales tool, not a repository 16 for design documents. So I think there's a bit of a 17 misunderstanding on Datacore's part about what 18 Salesforce is used for. It's a tool where sales 19 people track potential sales opportunities.</p> <p>20 So if they start talking to a customer, 21 a potential customer, they document their interactions 22 with that customer. If the customer ends up 23 purchasing something from Scale's product offerings, 24 then that gets documented. So it's not a repository</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 36</p> <p>1 we're withholding. We've gone back to our client 2 numerous times at the request of Datacore to ask yet 3 again, is there anything else? Is there anything 4 else? We haven't limited to 2016 or any particular 5 date. We've repeatedly asked and produced everything 6 we could produce. I'm not sure what more Datacore's 7 hoping that we can provide [REDACTED] [REDACTED]</p> <p>9 And I'll just point out, Mr. Alexander 10 spent less than a day looking at the code. And he 11 never returned after we supplemented the source code 12 computer. In over 10 years of patent litigation, I've 13 never seen a source code reviewer spend less than a 14 day on a code review and say, I don't understand it. 15 So it's a little surprising that Mr. Alexander has 16 concluded he doesn't understand the code when he spent 17 such little time on it.</p> <p>18 But again, we're very short on time, so 19 I'll stop there. I just want to make sure I answer 20 your questions, Your Honor.</p> <p>21 THE COURT: Thank you. What 22 exactly -- how was the source code supplemented? What 23 was missing during the review and what did Scale do to 24 remedy it?</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 35</p> <p>1 for design documents. So --</p> <p>2 THE COURT: But it -- has documents 3 that, you know, that's not its main function, but 4 there may be design documents in there if the 5 Salesforce needs to highlight the properties or 6 attributes of the software or whatever. Has it even 7 been searched? I guess more importantly before, you 8 know, all of us here speculating as to what might be 9 found there, has it been searched?</p> <p>10 MS. GORDINA: The Sales -- so we have 11 not run an ESI search term search against Salesforce. 12 I'm not even sure if that's technically possible. But 13 to the extent there are any documents in Salesforce, 14 for example, a salesperson sends a brochure to a 15 customer, a customer wouldn't be privy to confidential 16 design documents if they were to exist.</p> <p>17 So the types of documents Salesforce 18 would potentially have within it would be the same 19 types of documents that we've already produced. 20 There's no shortage of documents in our production 21 about how the product operates, customer-facing 22 documentation, brochures, manuals, theory of operation 23 documents, white papers. We've produced all of that.</p> <p>24 There's nothing on the design side that</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 37</p> <p>1 MS. GORDINA: Well, the Fleet Manager 2 code was added. So Fleet Manager was added for the 3 first time in Datacore's final infringement 4 contentions. They -- they added it as an accused 5 product. And when Mr. Alexander reviewed the code, I 6 believe the one time he reviewed the code, the fleet 7 manager code wasn't on the laptop yet, and we added it 8 within days.</p> <p>9 But I don't think that's what Datacore 10 is really taking issue with. I think their motion 11 isn't really about -- well, I'll just stop there. 12 I'll answer your questions since we're so short on 13 time.</p> <p>14 THE COURT: All right. Thank you.</p> <p>15 Anything further, Ms. Benassi?</p> <p>16 MS. BENASSI: I would just state that 17 there were multiple Scale witnesses that testified 18 that documents are stored in Salesforce.</p> <p>19 THE COURT: Understood, but the type of 20 documents are what's likely been produced, which is 21 what Datacore is complaining about. These are all 22 customer-facing documents, user -- end-user documents, 23 which would make sense to store in a sales marketing 24 database.</p>

1 And at this point, well after the 2 deadline for fact discovery, I'd need a little more of 3 a showing of good cause and a reasonable basis for 4 forcing Scale to go back and do search terms against 5 that database, if it's even possible. 6 Anything further on that point to 7 persuade me otherwise? 8 MS. BENASSI: No, nothing further, Your 9 Honor. 10 THE COURT: All right. I'm going to 11 deny without prejudice the Motion to Compel Production 12 of Relevant Design and Development Documents. I'm 13 satisfied based upon Scale's response to this that it 14 has done and -- it has looked for, gathered, and 15 produced everything that is responsive to that 16 category of documents, and that the documents, the 17 sort of design and development documents that Datacore 18 seeks, [REDACTED] 19 I have found that also that there is no 20 good cause, at least on the record made on this call, 21 to compel Scale to go back beyond the six-year 22 limitation in the default standard for discovery and 23 continue to look for such documents based upon the 24 excerpts of the transcripts of the witnesses	Page 38 1 First, I understand and I have seen listed the 2 replacement custodians that Scale is seeking in this 3 case, Alexander Best, Amit Baranwal, Abhijit Dey, 4 David Zabrowski, and Kevin Thimble. 5 First, let me ask a question about one 6 that I call the easy one, Mr. or Ms. Dey, D-E-Y. That 7 seems to be an individual who's not connected in any 8 way with the accused or with the SANsymphony product 9 that's at issue and I guess surrounds part -- is part 10 of the issue that drives this request. Why are you 11 looking for custodial information from that individual 12 if he's got nothing to do with the SANsymphony 13 product? 14 MS. GORDINA: So Your Honor, Mr. Dey 15 was identified based on documentation we saw, 16 specifically an email with a Mr. Bassett who is an 17 identified witness on the paragraph three disclosures 18 and someone we deposed. 19 Mr. Dey appears to be more involved in 20 the overall business of Datacore not specific to a 21 particular product. Again, we're going off of limited 22 information. We don't know what we don't know. We've 23 received just under 1,500 documents total from 24 Datacore in this matter in all of the discovery.
Page 39 1 Loughmiller and Hank Hsieh. 2 I'm not convinced that either or both 3 of them has confirmed that there is a collection of 4 documents somewhere relating to design and development 5 that was missed or overlooked or not produced for 6 whatever reason. I'm satisfied, as I said earlier, 7 that everything relevant to design and development has 8 been produced. And I think in my view it would be a 9 fishing expedition for me to order Scale to go and 10 look into the Salesforce database for anything more 11 that may be relevant to design and development 12 documents. 13 So on this record, the request is 14 denied without prejudice. 15 Let's move on to the last issue, which 16 is Scale's issue seeking replacement document 17 custodians to search for ESI from Datacore. And I 18 will hear Scale on that point. 19 MS. GORDINA: And Your Honor, just so I 20 know how to tailor my discussion, how much time do we 21 have left? Do we really only have two minutes left or 22 can we go past the hour mark? 23 THE COURT: You can have a few more 24 minutes. Really here, let me ask my questions.	Page 40 1 So we could be slightly off when we 2 identified Mr. Dey. Again, it was based on limited 3 information. But we feel that the other four we've 4 identified, their names have come up repeatedly as 5 persons with knowledge, and we don't see Datacore 6 really refuting that. 7 But with respect to Mr. Dey, to be 8 honest, we might have been off. Again, we're just 9 going off of a very limited set of documents that 10 we've received in discovery from Datacore. 11 THE COURT: All right. So let me 12 backtrack a little. You get these disclosures, these 13 paragraph three A disclosures of custodians from 14 Datacore, and that's roughly a little over a year ago 15 in October of early October 2022. 16 And it's my understanding that it 17 doesn't become an issue that five of these custodians 18 lacked any type of ESI. That doesn't become apparent 19 to Scale until October of 2023 after, I guess, 20 reviewing documents and seeing none from five that 21 were on the original list. Is that correct? 22 MS. GORDINA: That timeline is correct, 23 Your Honor. 24 THE COURT: And then some of them

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 42</p> <p>1 include inventors who have no ESI, is that correct?</p> <p>2 MS. GORDINA: The five individuals of</p> <p>3 the nine custodians for whom we've now just recently</p> <p>4 learned Datacore had no ESI, they are all inventors,</p> <p>5 correct.</p> <p>6 THE COURT: In fact, three of them have</p> <p>7 been originally identified in the paragraph three A</p> <p>8 disclosures have now been withdrawn. Scale is not</p> <p>9 going to even pursue depositions of them, is that</p> <p>10 correct?</p> <p>11 MS. GORDINA: Correct. For three of</p> <p>12 them, we agreed between the parties, stipulated that</p> <p>13 if Datacore agrees not to rely on them. Because these</p> <p>14 individuals are also listed on their initial</p> <p>15 disclosures, their rule 26 disclosures.</p> <p>16 So in exchange for Datacore agreeing</p> <p>17 not to bring those individuals to trial, we agreed not</p> <p>18 to take their depositions. We were attempting to</p> <p>19 streamline the issues to take only the important</p> <p>20 depositions. We've had I think 16 or 17 depositions</p> <p>21 just in this last month.</p> <p>22 THE COURT: Understood. And then with</p> <p>23 respect to Mr. Chen, his deposition, he is an</p> <p>24 inventor, he had no ESI. And his deposition was</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 44</p> <p>1 you know, as I said with regard to the other issues,</p> <p>2 these issues are always very case, fact intensive and</p> <p>3 case specific. Yeah, you can get up to 10. It</p> <p>4 doesn't mean that if you list 10, all of them are</p> <p>5 going to have relevant ESI to produce. There may be a</p> <p>6 smaller subset of them that have ESI.</p> <p>7 So if nine are listed or eight are</p> <p>8 listed or ten are listed, and it only turns out three</p> <p>9 or four of them have relevant ESI, where's the rule</p> <p>10 that says that triggers replacement custodians</p> <p>11 automatically?</p> <p>12 MS. GORDINA: No, Your Honor, there's a</p> <p>13 nuance there. Our argument isn't that you have to</p> <p>14 have 10 or you have to have 9. Our argument is we</p> <p>15 went through the entire course of fact discovery with</p> <p>16 the understanding that the search terms would be</p> <p>17 searched against the ESI of these custodians.</p> <p>18 It's one thing to think that you ran</p> <p>19 the search terms and there were no hits, there were no</p> <p>20 relevant documents. It's another thing to say there</p> <p>21 was nothing to search. Had they told us that there's</p> <p>22 nothing to search, we would have had our conversation.</p> <p>23 We would have had a meet and confer, an objective, and</p> <p>24 said, well, how about you add a few more people?</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 43</p> <p>1 taken, as I understand it, on November 3rd, is that</p> <p>2 correct?</p> <p>3 MS. GORDINA: No. Mr. Chen has not</p> <p>4 been deposed. So I'll just rewind. I think it's</p> <p>5 beneficial to have some context here. So these</p> <p>6 inventors were listed as custodians for whom Datacore</p> <p>7 represented to us that Datacore had their ESI. They</p> <p>8 also --</p> <p>9 THE COURT: I understand, and I</p> <p>10 understand that Datacore never updated its disclosures</p> <p>11 to say, hey, you know, five of these folks don't have</p> <p>12 any ESI to produce. And it would have been nice</p> <p>13 before the close of fact discovery if that had been</p> <p>14 done, and that would have given Scale an opportunity</p> <p>15 to say, can we talk about replacing them with other</p> <p>16 custodians. But and again, you know, I'll talk to</p> <p>17 Datacore about the timeline of these.</p> <p>18 But what I'm losing and missing from</p> <p>19 Scale's argument is why a party who initially lists</p> <p>20 custodians who turn out later to have no ESI, what</p> <p>21 role or authority is there that requires that party to</p> <p>22 substitute others in their place?</p> <p>23 You know, although the discovery</p> <p>24 default standard gives each side up to 10 custodians,</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 45</p> <p>1 It's not the case where Datacore is so</p> <p>2 small that they don't have more than three or four</p> <p>3 people who qualify as a custodian under the paragraph</p> <p>4 three disclosures. It's that they basically had</p> <p>5 filler names on their paragraph three disclosures,</p> <p>6 names of individuals for whom they couldn't have</p> <p>7 produced an ESI because now we know they have none.</p> <p>8 And they never told us.</p> <p>9 It was only after we pressed the issue</p> <p>10 and we said, it looks suspicious that you don't have</p> <p>11 any documents for these five custodians. They came</p> <p>12 back to us in mid-October and said, oh, we don't have</p> <p>13 any emails, we don't have any ESI.</p> <p>14 So they essentially deprived us of</p> <p>15 being able to get documents and ESI from custodians</p> <p>16 who would possibly, had they run ESI search numbers</p> <p>17 against those other custodians, they would have been</p> <p>18 able to produce some documents. I</p> <p>19 It's very alarming that Datacore has</p> <p>20 produced less than 1,500 documents in this case. And</p> <p>21 over 300 of those documents are printouts from Scale's</p> <p>22 website, and another 140-some are just slip sheets</p> <p>23 [ph].</p> <p>24 So they've produced about 1,000</p>

<p>1 documents, and it's becoming clear how they got there. 2 What they did wasn't in the spirit of the paragraph 3 three disclosures. Their approach to discovery here 4 is not in line with the spirit of what the default 5 standard asks the parties to do. And the parties here 6 agreed to abide by the default standard. We just, 7 now --</p> <p>8 THE COURT: Yeah, we're not talking 9 about -- again, I will get into the compliance with 10 the default standard with Datacore. That's not what 11 the issue is about. And I understand it's, you know, 12 it's something that is very troubling to Scale that it 13 was handled that way.</p> <p>14 But Scale's got to show a basis for the 15 relief it's seeking. And I started asking about these 16 witnesses. I'm still not convinced that this 17 individual, Dey, who is an executive officer of an 18 unrelated Datacore division, Perifery, is a custodian 19 who's likely to have relevant ESI. But let's move off 20 him.</p> <p>21 You've got two 30(b)(6) depositions 22 coming up. Or you have a 30(b)(6) deposition coming 23 up with two witnesses, Zabrowski and Thimble. It's 24 clear in patent litigation that just because certain</p>	<p>Page 46</p> <p>1 [REDACTED] [REDACTED] He couldn't recall 4 details. He couldn't recall who was involved in that 5 analysis, what the results were.</p> <p>6 Had we had the opportunity to have 7 Datacore run ESI search terms against Mr. Zabrowski's 8 ESI and his emails, we very likely would have found 9 documents relating to that very issue, which is very 10 pertinent to the case. It's very much relevant to the 11 case.</p> <p>12 So we did our best to identify five 13 replacement custodians who would have relevant 14 information. Again, we might have missed the mark 15 with Mr. Dey, but with respect to Zabrowski, Thimble, 16 it's not merely that they're 30(b)(6) witnesses. 17 Their testimony shows that they have information 18 relevant to the issues in the case. And where their 19 memory stops and they say I can't remember at the 20 deposition, that's where the documents would have been 21 helpful to us.</p> <p>22 And I think that's the concern, is we 23 missed out on that discovery because Datacore listed 24 people that shouldn't have even been listed. We now</p>
<p>1 witnesses are designated as 30(b)(6) witnesses on 2 behalf of a company, it's not necessarily the case 3 that those are the witnesses who have also been 4 designated as ESI custodians and whose ESI has been 5 searched.</p> <p>6 You know, again, there's no hard and 7 fast rule that noticing, designating certain witnesses 8 in response to a 30(b)(6) Deposition Notice 9 automatically triggers and makes them records 10 custodians for purposes of a search of their ESI. At 11 least I'm not aware of any. And I think the case law 12 that I found that's not cited in either side's brief 13 is to the contrary.</p> <p>14 Are you aware of any case authorities 15 that designating a witness is a 30(b)(6) witness 16 automatically requires them to be designated as a 17 records custodian for ESI?</p> <p>18 MS. GORDINA: No, Your Honor, and 19 that's not quite our argument. Mr. Zabrowski's 20 relevance goes beyond just the mere fact that he was 21 identified as a 30(b)(6) witness.</p> <p>22 I'll give you a very clear example. At 23 his deposition, he testified that prior to his company 24 [REDACTED]</p>	<p>Page 47</p> <p>1 have a declaration from a Mr. Thimble at Datacore 2 saying, oh, we delete documents. So Datacore and its 3 attorneys should have known last October that these 4 five individuals shouldn't even be listed on paragraph 5 three disclosures because there's nothing to search 6 for them.</p> <p>7 THE COURT: Well, the search terms and 8 such were developed after they were designated, 9 correct?</p> <p>10 MS. GORDINA: That's correct. Yes. 11 The parties went through the process of identifying 12 search terms after that.</p> <p>13 THE COURT: How soon were the search 14 terms exchanged and document repositories of ESI, the 15 process for searching them began? Give me a timeframe 16 if you know. You may not know for Datacore, but at 17 least for Scale. When did that generally occur in the 18 litigation?</p> <p>19 MS. GORDINA: Well, for Scale, we ran 20 the search terms after Your Honor resolved the 21 dispute. You'll recall Datacore wanted to add 19 22 search terms and the rules allow for 10. And after 23 Your Honor ruled that they could only add 10, then 24 there was a timeline in your order for when they were</p>

<p>1 to give us those search terms. We ran the search 2 terms, and that's when we made our large email 3 production in mid-August before the close of fact 4 discovery. So we did it then.</p> <p>5 We received most of Datacore's ESI 6 production in the last 10 days of discovery.</p> <p>7 THE COURT: Got it.</p> <p>8 MS. GORDINA: And over 90 percent of 9 their production was in the last two weeks of 10 discovery.</p> <p>11 THE COURT: And just very briefly, for 12 these other two proposed replacement custodians, 13 Alexander Best and Amit Baranwal, what's their 14 significance and why do you think they're custodians 15 of relevant ESI?</p> <p>16 MS. GORDINA: So with respect to 17 Mr. Baranwal, his name came up multiple times in 18 depositions as someone who would have knowledge. 19 Mr. Bassett for a number of questions said, I would 20 contact my boss, Mr. Baranwal, about that. So he was 21 identified because of his knowledge with respect to 22 specifically the SANsymphony. And the same for 23 Mr. Best. His name came up as somebody with knowledge 24 of the product.</p>	<p>Page 50</p> <p>1 anything further from Scale before I do?</p> <p>2 MS. GORDINA: I don't believe so. I 3 would just again reiterate that we were really 4 surprised and caught off guard when we learned about 5 this just about a month ago in mid-October. It was 6 our understanding that the parties were in good faith 7 doing what paragraph three and ten --</p> <p>8 THE COURT: And I'm aware of the 9 circumstances. I'll get on that with Datacore. It's 10 been fully fleshed out in the briefing. And we've got 11 some limited time. My time is running --</p> <p>12 MS. GORDINA: Thank you, Your Honor. 13 Thank you. I'll stop there.</p> <p>14 THE COURT: -- other matters. Thank 15 you.</p> <p>16 Let me hear, Ms. Benassi, you know, 17 explain this to me as to how you designate all these 18 folks. And then, you know, well after fact discovery 19 closes, oh, well, we, you know, we just didn't realize 20 that five of them had nothing to produce. How does 21 that happen?</p> <p>22 MS. BENASSI: Yeah, Your Honor, with 23 respect to Datacore's October 4, 2022, paragraph three 24 disclosures, Datacore identified its six named</p>
<p>1 And the SANsymphony product is 2 important here because Datacore is making the claim 3 that they practice their product, that these products 4 compete with the accused product, and that that has 5 implications for lost profits and damages.</p> <p>6 So Mr. Baranwal and Mr. Best both came 7 up. Their names came up in the testimony of other 8 witnesses who said these individuals would know 9 certain things about SANsymphony relating to both the 10 technical and the marketing business side of it.</p> <p>11 THE COURT: Wouldn't searching the 12 emails of Best and Baranwal likely be cumulative, 13 particularly of Mr. Bassett if not others within 14 Datacore?</p> <p>15 MS. GORDINA: No, because Mr. Bassett 16 is very much a pure engineer. He doesn't deal with 17 the marketing. He doesn't deal with the business side 18 of the sales for the product. So his documentation, 19 albeit very limited, we've received, you know, a very 20 small production of his documents, it's more focused 21 on the software and the technical side of things as 22 opposed to the business marketing side.</p> <p>23 THE COURT: Okay. Anything further? I 24 have a question I want to ask the other side. But</p>	<p>Page 51</p> <p>1 inventors of the patent issue because they are the 2 inventors and this is a patent case. When we looked 3 at the patent, we looked at these individuals and 4 thought these are the people that are most likely to 5 have information relating to the development of the 6 inventions disclosed in the patent.</p> <p>7 The patent was filed in 2002, over 20 8 years ago, and almost no large company would maintain 9 ESI from that era. We identified these custodians on 10 our paragraph three disclosures because we thought, 11 okay, they might have information, they might be 12 relevant individuals to depose, they might recall 13 something. And we didn't know at the time if there 14 was going to be any other documents stored in any 15 other repository.</p> <p>16 What Datacore did was it collected 17 documents from all locations where relevant 18 information might be found and it ran its search terms 19 on those documents. And that included collecting 20 documents from document repositories, shared sites, 21 OneDrive, the engineering databases.</p> <p>22 This also included ESI from Nick 23 Connolly, who's the chief architect and co-founder of 24 Datacore, who's been identified by many fact</p>

14 (Pages 50 - 53)

<p>1 witnesses, if not all, as the main developer of the 2 invention disclosed in the patent. There's literally 3 no other locations where information relating to the 4 asserted patent might be stored, and we've produced 5 all responsive documents.</p> <p>6 So there may be documents that these 7 inventors wrote and put on a shared drive, and all of 8 those documents were searched for the inventor's 9 names, for the subject matter. Everything's been 10 produced.</p> <p>11 With respect to the other point I 12 wanted to make, Datacore and Scale reached an 13 agreement in August at Scale's request that Scale 14 would not depose four of the six inventors if Datacore 15 agreed not to rely on them at trial. Now, we agreed 16 to three. We were on the fence about Chen. Chen has 17 since not been deposed in this case. So even back in 18 August, Scale decided to forego the depositions of 19 these inventors.</p> <p>20 At no point until last month did Scale 21 seek to have the proposed custodians included in 22 Datacore's ESI disclosures, and discovery's been 23 closed for almost three months. With respect to --</p> <p>24 THE COURT: Yeah, but you know, you've</p>	<p>Page 54</p> <p>1 Datacore, gee, we're not getting documents from these 2 others, we better update our list of paragraph three A 3 custodians?</p> <p>4 MS. BENASSI: Well, there was no need 5 to update the custodial list. All of the documents 6 relating to the invention, the invention that's led to 7 the patent, have been produced.</p> <p>8 And you know, with respect to the 9 proposed custodians that Scale listed in its letter, 10 none of those people have non-duplicative information 11 that's relevant to the claims and defenses in this 12 litigation. I mean, at issue --</p> <p>13 THE COURT: Yeah, you could argue that, 14 but there's no measuring stick to determine that. I 15 mean, not that I doubt your arguments. You're an 16 officer of the court and I accept your arguments.</p> <p>17 But you know, Scale is in a position 18 now where all, you know, it was going forward with the 19 litigation at least since October of 2022 believing 20 that the custodians listed, all nine of them, had 21 discoverable ESI, and then it turns out that the 22 majority of them, five out of the nine, don't. And 23 didn't learn of that in time within the discovery 24 period to do anything about it. Only learned it by</p>
<p>Page 55</p> <p>1 made the same arguments on your motion to compel on 2 behalf of Datacore against them about a document dump. 3 They're saying that most of these documents came in, 4 I'm not necessarily saying that Datacore dumped them 5 on them, but the majority if not all of the relevant 6 documents from Datacore were produced very close to 7 the eve of the close of fact discovery in August. Is 8 that not the case, they weren't produced in June, 9 July, and August?</p> <p>10 MS. BENASSI: Your Honor, it goes back 11 to the nuance again. Scale's initial discovery 12 request related to the patent. And the documents we 13 produced back in May when we ran our search terms were 14 related to the patent. It wasn't until August 1st 15 that Scale served its second set of discovery requests 16 that sought information on SANsymphony, the product. 17 We produced all of those documents timely before the 18 close of fact discovery.</p> <p>19 THE COURT: In producing them, it 20 didn't occur to you that, you know, at that point, you 21 still hadn't produced anything from five of the 22 custodians that you had made or put on your list a 23 year prior, or at least August of 2022? In all of 24 these productions, it's not occurring at all to</p>	<p>Page 55</p> <p>1 going through the documents that were produced. 2 In any event, you know, I don't know 3 think that's going to solve the problem. But if you 4 have a response to that, I'll hear it. Because I do 5 have one important question that I want to make sure I 6 ask and hear your response before I make a ruling on 7 this and before I truly have to go in five minutes or 8 so.</p> <p>9 MS. BENASSI: Yes, Your Honor. Thank 10 you. So Scale had notice of Datacore's paragraph 11 three custodian since October 2022, and they never 12 objected to the custodians that the CEO, the CFO, the 13 Vice President of Product Development, the Director of 14 Product Management, and the GM should be listed as 15 custodians. Not once.</p> <p>16 The custodians that are on the 17 paragraph three disclosures are our inventors, and 18 those inventors would have information relating to the 19 patent. The proposed custodians do not have any 20 information relating to the asserted patent.</p> <p>21 And with respect to the depositions of 22 Mr. Bassett and Nikolov, all of Datacore's witnesses 23 have provided fulsome, substantive responses. There 24 wasn't one question they couldn't ask.</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 58</p> <p>1 And I'll also point again to a nuance 2 that counsel had just brought up with Mr. Baranwal. 3 She said his name came up multiple times in Bassett's 4 depo, but that's misleading, because they were asking 5 Mr. Bassett questions relating to what's Datacore's 6 policy related to document retention? He didn't know 7 what the policy was related to document retention. He 8 said he didn't know. And then they said, well, who 9 would you ask? And he said, I probably just ask my 10 boss, Mr. Baranwal.</p> <p>11 So he answered all substantive 12 questions relating to SANsymphony. And with respect 13 to Mr. Best, I'll quickly just say that, I mean, he 14 was asked questions, who else knows the product? Who 15 else knows the product besides you? And so --</p> <p>16 THE COURT: That's fine. And I don't 17 doubt your representations about what was said in 18 deposition. But let me further tweak that argument 19 with you.</p> <p>20 This dispute over adding these five 21 additional custodians has been fermenting so to speak 22 since early October. Within that time, from the time 23 this dispute, you know, arose and the parties 24 discussed it until now, end of November that we're</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 60</p> <p>1 MS. BENASSI: That's correct, Your 2 Honor.</p> <p>3 THE COURT: All right. Anything 4 further before I hear brief rebuttal from Scale?</p> <p>5 MS. BENASSI: I would just reiterate 6 that the information that they would seek from these 7 proposed custodians is duplicative of what has already 8 been produced.</p> <p>9 With respect to the SANsymphony 10 product, Datacore identified its vice president of 11 software engineering, its director of engineering, and 12 its senior software engineer for all technical aspects 13 of SANsymphony. And Datacore search their ESI as well 14 as all, again, document repositories. And Scale has 15 deposed all of these witnesses. They provided 16 substantive fulsome responses. There's not been any 17 issues with any of their depositions.</p> <p>18 And with respect to damages, Datacore 19 produced its annual financial statements, including 20 R&D costs, revenue costs, margins, units sold. And 21 Datacore further conceded to produce data on a monthly 22 basis and produce all of his audited financials going 23 back as far as it maintains that information.</p> <p>24 One last note I would say is besides</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 59</p> <p>1 having this hearing, did Datacore at any time attempt 2 at a minimum to run a hit count on running the search 3 terms against the ESI of these custodians that Scale 4 is pushing for? So that the Court and Scale, all of 5 us, has some sense of how many hits are on those 6 search terms for each of these custodians.</p> <p>7 And that is often very helpful to the 8 Court in resolving these types of issues, where hit 9 with a request to search the records of these new 10 custodians who had not been previously searched.</p> <p>11 MS. BENASSI: Sorry, Your Honor, just 12 to make sure I understand what you're asking --</p> <p>13 THE COURT: Did you run a hit count in 14 each of these proposed five custodians? That's 15 Baranwal, Dey, Zabrowski, Thimble, using the search 16 terms that the parties agreed on that you ran against 17 the other original custodians?</p> <p>18 MS. BENASSI: Okay. So you're asking 19 if we collected the emails for these proposed 20 custodians and ran the search terms on them?</p> <p>21 THE COURT: Yes, if you ran hit counts.</p> <p>22 MS. BENASSI: We have not, Your Honor.</p> <p>23 THE COURT: The idea with the universe 24 that is no way to determine I guess, right?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 61</p> <p>1 our P27 [ph] and 28, which have been resolved before 2 this Court, there are no other RFPs that Scale has 3 asserted are at issue, has found any deficiencies with 4 in terms of Datacore's document production.</p> <p>5 THE COURT: Very well. All right. 6 Final words from Scale, please.</p> <p>7 MS. GORDINA: Thank you, Your Honor. 8 Thank you, Your Honor. Very briefly, I was listening 9 very carefully to Ms. Benassi's argument, and with all 10 due respect, I think it misses the point. The point 11 here isn't we want them to produce documents that have 12 been deleted from the inventors. We accept that these 13 documents don't exist. We accept that there's a 14 limited number of inventors and they don't have ESI 15 for them. So we're not saying let's find five people 16 who will have that information. We accept their 17 representation that it's gone.</p> <p>18 What we're saying is they filled in 19 slots on their paragraph three disclosures with names 20 of people for whom they could not have produced 21 anything relevant. And that deprived us of discovery. 22 And had we known that, we could have had a 23 conversation about who else could have filled the 24 spot.</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 62</p> <p>1 So it's not a, let's try to find people 2 who have information about the invention. That's with 3 the inventors and it's gone. We're saying as a whole, 4 looking at all the issues in the case, there are other 5 custodians at Datacore with information relevant to 6 the issues.</p> <p>7 And we just simply did not get 8 discovery for them because of the way Datacore 9 approached this ESI disclosure and production 10 procedure. And it wasn't what we had understood. And 11 there was no way for us to know until we finally 12 pressed the issue and they told us about a month ago, 13 we don't have anything.</p> <p>14 So that's really the issue. It's not a 15 one for one, let's find people who could fill the 16 shoes of the inventors. And that's what Ms. Benassi 17 was really focused on. That's not the point. As a 18 whole, there are other people at Datacore, other 19 custodians with information relevant to the case. And 20 the example I gave about [REDACTED] [REDACTED]</p> <p>23 The documents of those custodians would 24 have been really helpful. They would have been</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 64</p> <p>1 to its claims of infringement and/or damages claims is 2 just so jeopardized by this, you know, deficient 3 discovery, that it's worthwhile then to open the door 4 up to five additional custodians.</p> <p>5 MS. GORDINA: Your Honor, I'll give you 6 a very clean example. One of the claims that Datacore 7 is making is that their products compete head to head 8 with the accused product of Scale and that they've 9 lost sales. They've lost profits. There's a void of 10 documents relating to that issue. We don't see 11 anything relating to the competition between the 12 companies, how it was tracked, whether sales were 13 lost.</p> <p>14 Ther is absolutely -- I mean, their 15 production is woefully deficient. We don't see 16 evidence about how the products technically operate 17 and how they practice their own patent. We don't see 18 any information about how these companies allegedly go 19 head to head and how Datacore loses sales. And that's 20 a core piece of their damages argument in the case.</p> <p>21 And that's just an area where we don't have anything.</p> <p>22 And it's now becoming clear why we 23 don't have anything. It's because people who would 24 have had information related to that issue, their</p>
<p>1 relevant and we were entitled to them. And we missed 2 out on that. And that's the problem here. It's not 3 resolved by just doing nothing, which is what I'm 4 hearing Datacore is proposing, let's do nothing. We 5 don't think that that's the remedy here.</p> <p>6 THE COURT: Is anything missing that is 7 critical to the case that you haven't gotten to date 8 through discovery? Because let's face it, there could 9 always be one or two or three more custodians that a 10 party wishes you could add to the list. But that's 11 why the Court puts the brakes on a limit of 10 absent 12 good cause.</p> <p>13 Because you could keep searching and 14 searching and searching, and arguably everyone 15 connected with the company at a particular time and 16 associated with a particular product line arguably has 17 relevant information. But you know, there has to be 18 some management of the scope and the volume of 19 discovery.</p> <p>20 MS. GORDINA: Of course.</p> <p>21 THE COURT: And unless there's 22 something on this record that demonstrates that 23 Datacore's production to date has been so woefully 24 inadequate that Scale's ability to prepare a defense</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 63</p> <p>1 documents simply weren't searched. And of course, 2 there's a limit. You can't search everything. That's 3 why the rule of limit to 10.</p> <p>4 And our position isn't you must have 10 5 or you must have 9. There's no magic number. But 6 we're just saying that we missed out on relevant 7 discovery in this case because of the way Datacore 8 approached discovery under the default standard. We 9 don't think it was what the rules intend or what the 10 parties, you know, had agreed to early on in the case 11 when we said we'll follow this procedure. I'll stop 12 there.</p> <p>13 THE COURT: Very well.</p> <p>14 Anything -- well, I think I've heard enough argument.</p> <p>15 On this record, I'm not satisfied that 16 there is a sufficient reasonable basis and/or good 17 cause to add five replacement custodians. Had Scale 18 been more targeted and focused in picking one or two 19 from these five and tying it in to the claims at issue 20 in this litigation and why a search far outside the 21 fact discovery deadline would be essential to Scale's 22 ability to litigate its defenses to Datacore's claim, 23 the Court may have been more inclined to find a 24 solution.</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 66</p> <p>1 But on this record, it's very thin. It 2 hasn't been tethered to any of the claims or defenses 3 being litigated. That's not to say, however, that the 4 Court condones the way these custodians were 5 identified and handled. As I mentioned, with respect 6 to the document dump, there are better ways of 7 litigating that would decrease the likelihood of 8 having these types of discovery issues coming before 9 the Court. But we're here now and there's nothing we 10 can do to correct the past. I can only go by the 11 record that's made before me.</p> <p>12 And while I may be hearing information 13 on this call that might weigh slightly in favor of 14 maybe selecting one or two of these custodians, it's 15 outside of the arguments that were briefed. And so 16 I'm hearing these arguments for the first time on this 17 call. I don't know that they've been vetted with the 18 other side.</p> <p>19 I can't really tell that there's been a 20 meaningful meet and confer and an attempt to reach a 21 compromise resolution, or at least for Scale to ask 22 Datacore, hey, we think that, for example, 23 hypothetically, Mr. Baranwal, was mentioned so 24 frequently by Mr. Bassett, can you least collect his</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 68</p> <p>1 But I'm not saying I would grant it, 2 particularly at this stage in the litigation where it 3 is so advanced, and now the parties are on the eve of 4 expert discovery, which opens a completely different 5 phase of the case.</p> <p>6 As the parties are aware, Judge 7 Williams indicated that he was keeping this case on 8 track for an August trial. He gave the parties some 9 flexibility to make some minor adjustments as needed 10 for witnesses and for the schedules of counsel. But 11 beyond that, this case is staying on track for an 12 August trial and the schedule will be maintained.</p> <p>13 And that is paramount in the Court's 14 case management practices here. And also factors into 15 how I've resolved these disputes today, and how I may 16 view any future disputes that arise out of the 17 depositions yet to be taken and/or the expert 18 discovery phase.</p> <p>19 So those are my rulings. I usually 20 allow the transcript to serve as the record of the 21 Court. And in this case, I will partially do that. 22 But I think it may be helpful to the parties to have a 23 written order as well simply memorializing the Court's 24 rulings and giving some basic rationale for each of</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 67</p> <p>1 ESI and run search terms against it so we would have a 2 sense of the universe of hit counts that come up when 3 you do that?</p> <p>4 There's nothing in front of the Court. 5 I'm, you know, trying to resolve this issue in a 6 complete vacuum based on, you know, a history of, you 7 know, perhaps manners of litigating that could have 8 been better and alleviated this problem had better 9 steps been taken months ago to inform that the 10 custodians originally designated weren't all the most 11 apt custodians for this case.</p> <p>12 But on this record, I deny the motion 13 to compel Datacore to collect, search, and produce ESI 14 from the five replacement custodians.</p> <p>15 But again having said that, as these 16 depositions go forward, certainly there are 17 depositions yet to be taken. If these witnesses are 18 questioned about having and/or maintaining any 19 documents that may be supportive of or may highlight 20 or be background information for the deposition 21 testimony that they're giving, and it turns out that 22 the particular witness has never had their ESI 23 searched, you know, that may form a basis for coming 24 back.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 69</p> <p>1 them. And I will do that promptly as well.</p> <p>2 With that, does the plaintiff have 3 anything further that the Court needs to address at 4 this time?</p> <p>5 MS. BENASSI: No. Thank you, Your 6 Honor.</p> <p>7 THE COURT: All right. Anything 8 further on behalf of the defendant Scale?</p> <p>9 MS. GORDINA: Your Honor, I'll just 10 mention some of the discussion today regarding the 11 deposition testimony, for example of Mr. Zabrowski, 12 that deposition took place after we filed our motion. 13 So some of the information that I provided in my 14 argument today was not available. It did not exist at 15 the time we filed our motion. I just wanted to put 16 that on the record.</p> <p>17 And then in addition, with respect to 18 the financial documents, I also just wanted to state 19 that we have not received them yet and don't have a 20 date certain for when we will receive them. But 21 assuming that Datacore will produce them in short 22 order, then that issue appears to be resolved.</p> <p>23 THE COURT: I appreciate that. And I 24 know that things happen in real time, and that you</p>

<p>1 don't often, you know, upon the writing of these 2 letter briefs have everything you need to inform the 3 Court, and I appreciate that clarification. 4 If there are any issues with respect to 5 the matters that had been resolved between the parties 6 and the Court did not have to rule on them, then you 7 can certainly come back to the Court if it's impacting 8 the expert discovery schedule, or any other -- or 9 causing any other concerns with respect to the 10 litigation.</p> <p>11 And all of my rulings are without 12 prejudice. I recognize that discovery is not a static 13 thing and things may occur during the course of 14 discovery that would cause a party to raise an issue 15 that perhaps did not, you know, seemed as it was 16 resolved.</p> <p>17 There may be subsequent discovery 18 issues that come up, that tie in with the issues that 19 I've addressed going forward in the litigation, and 20 each side is without prejudice to raise whatever 21 issues in the future it needs to with the Court as 22 appropriate. So let me be clear about that.</p> <p>23 With that, I thank everyone for your 24 time and for your arguments and for accommodating my</p>	<p>Page 70</p> <p>1 CERTIFICATE 2 I, ANDREW WEADER, the officer before whom 3 the foregoing proceedings were taken, do hereby 4 certify that any witness(es) in the foregoing 5 proceedings, prior to testifying, were duly sworn; 6 that the proceedings were recorded by me and 7 thereafter reduced to typewriting by a qualified 8 transcriptionist; that said digital audio recording of 9 said proceedings are a true and accurate record to the 10 best of my knowledge, skills, and ability; that I am 11 neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any 12 of the parties to the action in which this was taken; 13 and, further, that I am not a relative or employee of 14 any counsel or attorney employed by the parties 15 hereto, nor financially or otherwise interested in the 16 outcome of this action.</p> <p>17 <i>Andrew Weader</i></p> <p>18 ANDREW WEADER 19 Notary Public in and for the 20 State of Pennsylvania</p> <p>21</p> <p>22</p> <p>23</p> <p>24</p>
<p>1 schedule today. And we are concluded. I am 2 adjourning the conference call and disconnecting. 3 (Whereupon, at 1:38 p.m., the 4 proceeding was concluded.)</p> <p>5</p> <p>6</p> <p>7</p> <p>8</p> <p>9</p> <p>10</p> <p>11</p> <p>12</p> <p>13</p> <p>14</p> <p>15</p> <p>16</p> <p>17</p> <p>18</p> <p>19</p> <p>20</p> <p>21</p> <p>22</p> <p>23</p> <p>24</p>	<p>Page 71</p> <p>1 CERTIFICATE OF TRANSCRIBER 2 I, DANIEL O'CONNELL-SANTOS, do hereby 3 certify that this transcript was prepared from the 4 digital audio recording of the foregoing proceeding, 5 that said transcript is a true and accurate record of 6 the proceedings to the best of my knowledge, skills, 7 and ability; that I am neither counsel for, related 8 to, nor employed by any of the parties to the action 9 in which this was taken; and, further, that I am not a 10 relative or employee of any counsel or attorney 11 employed by the parties hereto, nor financially or 12 otherwise interested in the outcome of this action.</p> <p>13</p> <p>14 <i>Daniel O'Connell Santos</i></p> <p>15 DANIEL O'CONNELL-SANTOS</p> <p>16</p> <p>17</p> <p>18</p> <p>19</p> <p>20</p> <p>21</p> <p>22</p> <p>23</p> <p>24</p>

[& - accommodating]

Page 1

&	2	302 3:9 31 6:16 23:23 25:16 26:6 31st 8:15 323 2:16 3rd 43:1	628 2:9 6322712 1:19 6th 3:6 7 70 18:13 8 844 1:15 9 9 44:14 65:5 90 18:10 50:8 90067 2:15 94105 2:7 984-6000 3:9 99 7:5,17,23 a abhijit 40:3 abide 46:6 ability 11:4 12:3 63:24 65:22 72:10 73:7 able 14:7,10 20:24 22:8,18 22:19 28:18 33:15 45:15,18 absent 63:11 absolutely 64:14 absorb 20:24 accept 56:16 61:12,13,16 accommodati... 70:24
& 2:5,13 3:4 5:15 6:3,22	20 53:7 2002 32:10 33:13 53:7 2012 32:9,11 33:13 2016 33:1 36:4 2022 41:15 52:23 55:23 56:19 57:11 2023 1:11 8:7 23:23 41:19 210-2925 2:16 22-535 1:7 5:4 25386 72:17 26 42:15 267,466 9:3 26th 23:2 27 8:7 28 61:1 28529 73:14 28th 2:14 29 1:11	5,000 12:20 17:5,14 18:18 21:20 5,100 7:19 14:6 14:8,12 19:11 20:6 22:17 5,122 23:16 5,127 8:15 5600 2:6 577-0107 2:9	3 6 6 7:10 8:2,17 9:13,19,22 10:11 11:11 15:4 16:13 17:18 21:2,24 25:11,19 46:21 46:22 47:1,8 47:15,21 48:16 30,000 10:16,17 300 45:21
1	1 8:10,13 1,000 45:24 1,500 40:23 45:20 10 9:4,12 18:11 21:19 36:12 43:24 44:3,4 44:14 49:22,23 50:6 63:11 65:3,4 12 7:3 12:11 1:12 1313 3:6 137,172 9:3 13th 20:10,18 14 1:16 140 45:22 151,074 8:9 15th 15:24 16 42:20 17 42:20 18 7:21 18th 8:22 10:19 14:13 20:10,19 19 9:4 49:21 1900 2:14 19801 1:17 3:7 1998 32:19 1:38 71:3 1st 18:12 55:14		

[accomplished - asks]

Page 2

accomplished	adjusted 13:6	amend 11:11	approaching
25:24	adjustments	amit 40:3 50:13	47:24
accurate 72:9	9:16 10:2 68:9	amount 16:12	appropriate
73:5	advance 15:20	analysis 13:17	24:13 70:22
accused 26:22	advanced 68:3	48:2,3,5 62:21	apt 67:11
29:17 32:10	advertisements	analyze 7:9	architect 30:5
33:3,12 37:4	23:12	12:19 14:6	53:23
40:8 51:4 64:8	afternoon 5:13	15:3 33:15	area 64:21
acquisition	5:24 6:4 17:1	34:11	arguably 63:14
47:24	ago 41:14 52:5	analyzed 48:1	63:16
action 72:12,16	53:8 62:12	analyzing	argue 56:13
73:8,12	67:9	13:17	argued 31:13
actually 10:17	agree 10:21	anderson 3:4	argues 34:7
21:23 27:7	agreed 32:19	andrew 1:18	argument 7:15
29:6 33:3	42:12,17 46:6	72:2,18	13:4 22:21,23
add 44:24	54:15,15 59:16	angeles 2:15	28:7 34:4
49:21,23 63:10	65:10	annual 60:19	43:19 44:13,14
65:17	agreeing 42:16	answer 20:16	47:19 58:18
added 37:2,2,4	agreement	20:21 23:9	61:9 64:20
37:7	54:13	36:19 37:12	65:14 69:14
adding 58:20	agrees 42:13	answered	arguments 5:7
addition 69:17	alarming 45:19	58:11	6:4 12:12 55:1
additional 8:15	albeit 8:22	apparent 41:18	56:15,16 66:15
11:21 15:1	51:19	apparently	66:16 70:24
16:13 19:9	alexander	26:16	arose 58:23
21:2 25:6	28:24 29:4,9	appear 23:11	aside 5:5,8 33:6
29:17 32:13	36:9,15 37:5	appearances	asked 10:19
58:21 64:4	40:3 50:13	5:11	17:10 21:23
address 34:3	allegedly 22:3	appears 40:19	23:2,7 28:10
69:3	64:18	69:22	31:1,7 32:7,18
addressed	alleviated 67:8	appreciate	36:5 58:14
70:19	allow 49:22	69:23 70:3	asking 46:15
adjourning	68:20	approach 46:3	58:4 59:12,18
71:2	alternative	approached	asks 46:5
	10:21 21:5	62:9 65:8	

[aspects - bindu]

Page 3

aspects	60:12	47:9,16	believing	56:19		
asserted	54:4	available	69:14	benassi	2:3	
57:20	61:3	avenue	2:14	5:17,17	6:21	
assist	19:22	aware	19:16	6:22	8:5,20	
20:5		47:11,14	52:8	9:1	10:8	
assistance	20:1	68:6	basic	68:24	9:15,21	
associated	63:16		basically	45:4	10:8	
assuming	16:14	b	basis	19:21	11:14,20	
69:21		b	20:4,9,18	12:5	12:5	
attempt	59:1	4:1	23:15	15:19	16:7,16	
66:20		7:10	38:3	16:20	18:9	
attempting	13:20	8:2	46:14	22:1,7,14,15	18:9	
42:18		9:17	60:22	26:20	28:8	
attend	5:9	9:22	65:16	29:6,15,21		
attended	29:1	10:11	67:23	30:23	32:5	
attorney	72:14	11:11	bassett	51:13,15	32:5	
73:10		15:4	40:16	57:22	33:11,23	
attorneys	49:3	16:13	58:5	37:15	37:15	
attributes	35:6	17:18	66:24	38:8		
audio	72:8	21:2,24	bassett's	52:16,22	55:10	
73:4		25:11	58:3	55:10		
audited	60:22	25:19	becoming	56:4	57:9	
august	6:16	46:21,22	46:1	59:11,18,22		
8:14	9:4,12	48:16	64:22	60:1,5	62:16	
10:9	14:19	back	began	69:5		
23:23	25:16	11:11	49:15	benassi's	17:13	
26:6	50:3	15:7,9,9,14	beginning	61:9		
54:13,18	55:7	23:4	10:10	beneficial	43:5	
55:9,14,23		25:5	behalf	40:3	48:12	
68:8,12		29:4	2:2,11	50:13,23	51:6	
authorities	47:14	29:18,22	3:2	51:12	58:13	
authority	43:21	32:7	5:15	72:10	73:6	
automatically	13:15	background	belated	better	56:2	
44:11		67:20	7:18,24	66:6	67:8,8	
		backtrack	25:7,15	beyond	33:9	
		41:12	belatedly	24:7	38:21	
		balance	13:10	26:6	47:20	
		balancing	24:7	68:11		
		19:4	believe	52:2	biggest	9:2
		baranwal	21:21	bindu	3:3	
		40:3	31:3	6:1		
		50:13,17,20	32:3			
		51:6,12	37:6			
		58:2				
		58:10	believed			
		59:15	18:5			
			31:9			

[bit - come]

Page 4

bit 5:6 18:16 31:10 34:16	c	70:14 causing 70:9 ceo 57:12 certain 14:9 46:24 47:7 calendar 5:10 call 9:10,10 24:5 38:20 40:6 66:13,17 71:2 calls 7:13 carefully 61:9 carried 24:2,9 case 7:1,6 10:24 11:3 13:12,22 24:8 24:8 25:2 26:8 26:23 28:3 29:5 32:9,10 33:12,20 40:3 44:2,3 45:1,20 47:2,11,14 48:10,11,18 53:2 54:17 building 1:14 bulk 7:9 8:21 11:12 burden 20:4 24:3,9 business 40:20 48:2 51:10,17 51:22 busy 20:14 button 25:13	clearly 19:5 23:13 client 36:1 close 8:10,12 8:14,18 9:5,12 12:21 18:8,15 43:13 50:3 55:6,7,18 closed 23:4 54:23 closely 8:4 closes 52:19 closing 9:18 13:10 code 27:10 28:10,12,13,17 28:21 29:1,11 29:18,23 30:1 30:7,12 36:10 36:11,13,14,16 36:22 37:2,5,6 37:7 colleague 5:16 collect 66:24 67:13 collected 53:16 59:19 collecting 53:19 collection 31:21 32:1,4 39:3 come 15:7 41:4 67:2 70:7,18
	category 38:16 caught 52:4 cause 33:8,8,18 33:22 38:3,20 63:12 65:17	8:9 clean 64:6 clear 9:2 22:16 26:9 46:1,24 47:22 64:22 70:22	

[coming - court]

Page 5

coming 19:22 20:13 25:5 30:13 46:22,22 66:8 67:23	component 30:12 components 30:8	contemplating 21:9 contentions 33:16 37:4	corroon 3:4 costs 60:20,20 counsel 5:7,12 6:8 10:24 17:19 58:2
comment 22:8	compromise 66:21	contents 17:9	68:10 72:11,14
committed 12:13	computer 29:3 29:18 36:12	context 43:5 continue 38:23	73:7,10
companies 48:1 64:12,18	computing 1:7 2:11 3:2 5:22	contoured 25:6 contours 24:16	count 59:2,13 counts 59:21 67:2
company 47:2 47:23 53:8 63:15	conceded 60:21 concern 48:22	contradicted 22:2,4 contradiction 31:10	couple 27:21 32:12
company's 27:11	concerns 70:9	contradicts 17:16	course 17:24
compel 6:12 23:21 26:11 38:11,21 55:1 67:13	conclusory 13:5	contrary 47:13	44:15 63:20 65:1 70:13
compelling 26:18	condense 5:7 condones 66:4	conversation 44:22 61:23	court 1:1 5:2,4 5:10,18,20 6:5
compete 51:4 64:7	confer 23:2 conference 6:9	convined 39:2 46:16	7:12 8:16,21
competition 64:11	71:2	copies 12:5,6	9:8,16 10:1
complaining 37:21	conferred 17:20	core 15:6 64:20	11:10,15,23
complete 24:17 32:18 67:6	confidential 35:15	corporation 1:4 2:2	12:8 13:3,8
completely 7:2 68:4	confirm 31:20 confirmed 39:3	correct 8:19,20 9:1,14,15 10:8	14:12 15:16
completion 8:12 18:12	connected 40:7 63:15	10:23 11:13,14	16:5,9,18,22
compliance 46:9	connolly 53:23	11:20 12:4,7	19:8,18 20:22
	cont'd 3:1	12:11 14:15	22:10,14 23:18
	contact 50:20	16:16 30:23	23:20 24:6,14
		41:21,22 42:1	25:5,20 27:21
		42:5,10,11	28:23 29:13,16
		43:2 49:9,10	30:2 31:11
		60:1 66:10	33:5,17 34:1
			35:2 36:21
			37:14,19 38:10
			39:23 41:11,24
			42:6,22 43:9
			46:8 49:7,13

[court - deficiencies]

Page 6

50:7,11 51:11	47:10 48:13	18:19,22 19:5	65:22
51:23 52:8,14	50:12,14 53:9	19:21 21:8,17	date 1:11 8:1,3
54:24 55:19	54:21 55:22	22:12 24:2,8	8:6 36:5 63:7
56:13,16 58:16	56:3,9,20	24:17 25:9	63:23 69:20
59:4,8,13,21,23	57:12,15,16,19	26:4,17 28:5	david 40:4
60:3 61:2,5	58:21 59:3,6	30:22 32:18	day 15:9 36:10
63:6,11,21	59:10,14,17,20	33:15 34:7,8	36:14
65:13,23 66:4	60:7 62:5,19	36:2 37:9,21	days 9:4,12
66:9 67:4	62:23 63:9	38:17 39:17	11:7 18:11
68:21 69:3,7	64:4 65:17	40:20,24 41:5	37:8 50:6
69:23 70:3,6,7	66:4,14 67:10	41:10,14 42:4	de 1:17 3:7
70:21	67:11,14	42:13,16 43:6	deadline 6:16
court's 5:18 7:2	customer 34:20	43:7,10,17	7:20 8:11
68:13,23	34:21,22,22	45:1,19 46:10	12:16 18:12
crawl 26:1	35:15,15,21	46:18 48:1,7	38:2 65:21
create 30:2	37:22	48:23 49:1,2	deadlines 7:4
created 28:5	cut 23:23 24:7	49:16,21 51:2	deal 51:16,17
38:18	25:16 26:6	51:14 52:9,24	dealt 26:13
critical 63:7	d	53:16,24 54:12	decided 54:18
cumulative	d 5:1 40:6	54:14 55:2,4,6	declaration
51:12	damages 51:5	56:1 59:1	49:1
cure 13:20	60:18 64:1,20	60:10,13,18,21	decrease 66:7
current 12:16	daniel 73:2,15	62:5,8,18 63:4	default 32:13
currently 12:16	data 60:21	64:6,19 65:7	32:16 33:5,10
custodial 40:11	database 34:8	66:22 67:13	33:19 38:22
56:5	37:24 38:5	69:21	43:24 46:4,6
custodian 45:3	39:10	datacore's 6:12	46:10 65:8
46:18 47:17	databases	8:24 10:4,24	defendant 1:8
57:11	53:21	11:4 13:2	2:11 3:2 4:7
custodians	datacore 1:4	17:19 26:11	6:2 69:8
39:17 40:2	2:2 5:3,12 6:18	28:2 34:4,17	defense 63:24
41:13,17 42:3	6:19 7:7,8,11	36:6 37:3 50:5	defenses 56:11
43:6,16,20,24	8:3 11:9 12:19	52:23 54:22	65:22 66:2
44:10,17 45:11	12:23 14:5	57:10,22 58:5	deficiencies
45:15,17 47:4	17:6 18:10,12	61:4 63:23	61:3

[deficient - discovery's]

Page 7

deficient	64:2 64:15	10:11,19,22 11:2,13,16,16	designer	27:18	disclosure	62:9
delaware	1:2 5:14	12:2 14:20,23 15:4,9,13	details	21:8 27:6 48:4	disclosures	40:17 41:12,13 42:8,15,15
delete	49:2	17:12 18:1	determine	56:14 59:24	determined	43:10 45:4,5 46:3 49:5
deleted	61:12	42:9,18,20,20		21:1		52:24 53:10
demonstrates	63:22	46:21 50:18	developed	24:16 49:8	developed	54:22 57:17 61:19
demonstrating	24:9	54:18 57:21 60:17 67:16,17 68:17	developer	54:1	disconnecting	71:2
denied	39:14	deprived	45:14 61:21	developers		discoverable
denies	23:20	describing	31:19	development	30:11	56:21
deny	38:11 67:12	description	4:2 4:6 30:16	development	26:12,19,21	discovery
depo	58:4	design	26:12,18 26:21 27:2,5 27:16 28:4	description	27:2 28:4	5:5 6:15 7:1,22
depose	53:12 54:14	30:10,15 31:2 31:21 32:24	30:10,15 31:22 38:12,17 39:4	design	30:10,15 31:22	8:11,13,14,18 9:5,13,18
deposed	11:22 21:19 40:18 43:4 54:17 60:15	33:14 34:16 35:1,4,16,24 38:12,17 39:4 39:7,11	38:12,17 39:4 39:7,11 53:5 57:13	dey	38:12,17 39:4	12:21 13:10,11 14:19 18:8,11
deposition	7:10 8:2,7 9:13,19 11:6,12 14:24 15:11,12 16:3 16:5,13 17:18 19:1 21:2,12 21:17 25:11 26:8 27:8,24 31:1 42:23,24 46:22 47:8,23 48:20 58:18 67:20 69:11,12	33:14 34:16 35:1,4,16,24 38:12,17 39:4 39:7,11 designate	40:19 41:2,7 46:17 48:15 59:15	dey	40:3,6,14 40:19 41:2,7	18:15 23:4,23 24:7 26:24
depositions	9:20,23 10:7	52:17 designated	46:17 48:15 59:15	different	46:17 48:15	32:14,16 33:7 38:2,22 40:24
		47:1,4,16 49:8 67:10	59:15 designating	7:15 29:7 68:4	difficult	41:10 43:13,23 44:15 46:3
		47:7,15	47:7,15	17:21 19:14 27:13	difficult	48:23 50:4,6 50:10 52:18
		designed	47:7,15	27:13 digital	17:21 19:14	55:7,11,15,18
		32:8	47:7,15	72:8 73:4	digital	56:23 61:21
		32:11 33:2,4	47:7,15	73:4 directly	73:4	62:8 63:8,19
		33:13	47:7,15	34:5,12	directly	64:3 65:7,8,21
				57:13 60:11	director	66:8 68:4,18 70:8,12,14,17
				53:6 54:2	disclosed	discovery's
						54:22

[discuss - engineer]

Page 8

discuss	13:8 17:17 30:6	documenting	40:23 41:9,20 44:20 45:11,15	e
discussed	58:24	documents	45:18,20,21 46:1 48:9,20	e 2:1,1 3:1,1 4:1 5:1,1 40:6
discussion	9:11 18:14,16 19:21 39:20 69:10	6:15 7:6,10,19 8:10,14,15,22 9:3,17 10:13	49:2 51:20 53:14,17,19,20	earlier 12:2 24:5 39:6
disfavors	13:9 19:18 24:6	10:16 11:11 12:20,22 13:1	54:5,6,8 55:3,6 55:12,17 56:1	early 41:15 58:22 65:10
disposed	26:15	14:6,8,9,12,20	56:5 57:1	ease 20:4
dispute	5:5 49:21 58:20,23	15:3,15,18 16:2,8 17:6,9	61:11,13 62:23 64:10 65:1	easier 9:9
disputes	7:22 68:15,16	17:11,14,24 18:2,10,13,18	67:19 69:18 doing 21:3 52:7	easy 40:6
disrupt	25:24	18:19,23 19:1	63:3	effect 13:21
district	1:1,2	19:3,11 20:6	domino 13:21	effort 25:3
division	46:18	20:14 21:1,20	door 64:3	eight 11:7 44:7
docket	5:3 8:4	21:24 22:3,5	doubt 56:15	either 13:9
document	6:15 7:3,20,23 8:8 8:12 9:11 13:9 13:16 15:1 19:18,24 23:11 24:6 25:4,15 33:14 34:21 39:16 49:14 53:20 55:2 58:6,7 60:14 61:4 66:6	22:17,22 23:3 23:6,10,15,16 23:22 24:10,18 25:7,10 26:5 26:13,19,21,24 27:3,4,5,10,11 27:14,16,19 28:1,4,10,11,17 28:21,24 31:2 31:8,9,12,21 32:8,13,21,24	58:17 drive 54:7 drives 40:10 due 11:5,8 15:23 21:4 61:10 duly 72:5 dump 9:11 13:16 19:24 25:15 55:2 66:6	15:12 39:2 47:12
documentation	28:15 29:23 30:3 35:22 40:15 51:18	33:2,9 34:7,9 34:16 35:1,2,4 35:13,16,17,19 35:20,23 37:18	dumped 55:4 dumping 20:6 dumps 13:9 19:18 24:6	email 20:12 40:16 50:2
documented	34:24	37:20,22,22 38:12,16,16,17 38:23 39:4,12	duplicative 56:10 60:7	emails 18:20 45:13 48:8 51:12 59:19

[engineering - first]

Page 9

engineering 53:21 60:11,11 engineers 27:6 entire 44:15 entitled 63:1 envisioning 16:6 equated 9:3 era 53:9 es 72:4 esi 35:11 39:17 41:18 42:1,4 42:24 43:7,12 43:20 44:5,6,9 44:17 45:7,13 45:15,16 46:19 47:4,4,10,17 48:7,8 49:14 50:5,15 53:9 53:22 54:22 56:21 59:3 60:13 61:14 62:9 67:1,13 67:22 esquire 2:3,4 2:12 3:3 essential 65:21 essentially 11:15 19:24 31:12 45:14 ethan 2:4 5:14 evd 4:2,6 eve 9:18 13:10 24:6 55:7 68:3	event 57:2 everything's 54:9 evidence 64:16 exactly 13:19 36:22 example 28:12 35:14 47:22 62:20 64:6 66:22 69:11 except 11:17 12:3 19:10 excerpts 38:24 exchange 42:16 exchanged 49:14 excluding 19:2 executive 46:17 exist 25:13 30:3 30:15,21 31:24 35:16 38:18 61:13 69:14 existence 28:1 31:18 exists 31:14 36:8 expect 5:9 expedition 39:9 expeditiously 24:22 expert 11:5,7 11:23 12:14 16:6 21:3,12 21:14 27:1 28:13 29:4,18	68:4,17 70:8 expert's 11:4 experts 12:6 13:2 34:11 explain 52:17 explains 16:10 extent 12:22 28:23 35:13 extreme 19:2 23:21 24:1,10 f face 63:8 facing 35:21 37:22 fact 8:11,12,14 8:18 9:5,12,18 9:20 11:13,16 11:21 12:21,24 18:8,11,15 20:6 22:2,4 23:3 24:11 32:3 38:2 42:6 43:13 44:2,15 47:20 50:3 52:18 53:24 55:7,18 65:21 factors 6:18 13:14 19:4 24:1,3 68:14 failed 18:9 faith 52:6 fallon 1:13 far 60:23 65:20 fast 47:7	faulting 24:20 favor 6:19 24:1 24:4 66:13 fc 34:10 federal 1:14 feel 12:10 41:3 feels 25:10 fence 54:16 fermenting 58:21 ferret 29:19 filed 32:10 33:13 53:7 69:12,15 fill 62:15 filled 61:18,23 filler 45:5 final 11:18 22:11 37:3 61:6 finally 62:11 financial 60:19 69:18 financially 72:15 73:11 financials 32:19 60:22 find 8:4 23:24 27:13 28:24 61:15 62:1,15 65:23 finding 19:14 fine 58:16 first 5:12 7:8 17:19 21:7
--	---	---	---

[first - grant]

Page 10

22:16,22 23:1 29:9 37:3 40:1 40:5 66:16 fishing 39:9 five 41:17,20 42:2 43:11 45:11 48:12 49:4 52:20 55:21 56:22 57:7 58:20 59:14 61:15 64:4 65:17,19 67:14 fleet 29:14 34:10 37:1,2,6 fleshed 52:10 flexibility 68:9 floor 2:14 3:6 30:18 focus 18:17 focused 17:3 51:20 62:17 65:18 folks 43:11 52:18 follow 65:11 forcing 38:4 forego 54:18 foregoing 72:3 72:4 73:4 form 6:14 12:15 21:5 28:2 30:20 67:23	formally 31:15 format 30:20 forward 6:7,10 6:11 10:11 11:19 13:23 56:18 67:16 70:19 found 27:2 35:9 38:19 47:12 48:8 53:18 61:3 founder 53:23 four 41:3 44:9 45:2 54:14 francisco 2:7 5:17 free 12:10 25:12 26:7 frequently 66:24 friday 11:5 front 67:4 full 14:19 fully 15:3 20:24 33:15 52:10 fulsome 57:23 60:16 function 35:3 functions 27:7 further 11:3 16:19 22:11 26:4 32:2 33:21 37:15 38:6,8 51:23 52:1 58:18	60:4,21 69:3,8 72:13 73:9 future 68:16 70:21 g g 5:1 gathered 38:14 gbw 1:7 gee 56:1 generally 26:7 30:20 49:17 getting 14:20 15:4 20:15 24:21 25:4 56:1 give 20:1 23:8 47:22 49:15 50:1 64:5 given 15:21 16:20 24:23 36:7 43:14 gives 43:24 giving 19:21 67:21 68:24 gm 57:14 go 6:7,10,11 11:11 12:3 15:14 16:1 29:18,22 38:4 38:21 39:9,22 57:7 64:18 66:10 67:16 goes 47:20 55:10	going 6:4 9:19 11:18 13:21,23 19:23 20:4 25:18 38:10 40:21 41:9 42:9 44:5 53:14 56:18 57:1,3 60:22 70:19 good 5:13,24 17:1 33:7,8,18 33:22 38:3,20 52:6 63:12 65:16 goodrich 2:13 6:3 gordina 2:12 6:2,3 16:23 17:1 20:8 21:6 22:13 34:14 35:10 37:1 39:19 40:14 41:22 42:2,11 43:3 44:12 47:18 49:10,19 50:8,16 51:15 52:2,12 61:7 63:20 64:5 69:9 gotten 21:18 63:7 grant 24:15 25:20 26:2 68:1
--	---	---	--

[guard - individuals]

Page 11

guard	52:4	30:18 34:2	32:6 33:11,24	identifying
guess	7:20	39:18 52:16	34:14 36:20	49:11
	19:13 26:13	57:4,6 60:4	38:9 39:19	ignored 7:2
	27:23 30:4	heard 65:14	40:14 41:23	illustrative
	31:14 35:7	hearing 1:10	44:12 47:18	62:22
	40:9 41:19	7:15 15:20	49:20,23 52:12	imagine 21:15
	59:24	21:7 22:1	52:22 55:10	impacting 70:7
h		30:16 59:1	57:9 59:11,22	impacts 21:13
		63:4 66:12,16	60:2 61:7,8	implausible
h	4:1	helpful 21:2	64:5 69:6,9	22:24
half	20:18,19	48:21 59:7	honorable 1:13	implications
hand	24:19	62:24 68:22	hope 24:22	51:5
	32:20	hercules 3:5	hoping 21:17	important
handled	13:12	hereto 72:15	36:7	17:23 33:14
	46:13 66:5	73:11	hour 5:8 39:22	42:19 51:2
handling	6:4	hey 43:11	hours 25:22	57:5
hank	30:5 39:1	66:22	hsieh 27:15	importantly
happen	9:23	high 23:11	30:5 39:1	22:21 35:7
	52:21 69:24	highlight 35:5	hsieh's 31:1,20	inadequate
happened		67:19	hundred 18:18	63:24
	10:15 11:3	hindered 12:14	hypercore	inadvertently
	14:17 20:14	history 67:6	29:14 34:10	18:3,7
happening	11:6	hit 15:8 34:5	hypothetically	inclined 65:23
	11:8 15:5	59:2,8,13,21	66:23	include 42:1
happy	8:6	67:2		included 53:19
hard	18:21	hits 44:19 59:5	idea 59:23	53:22 54:21
	21:15 47:6	honest 41:8	identified 18:1	including 60:19
harmed	7:7	honor 5:14 6:1	23:16 40:15,17	indicated 24:11
hc3	34:10	6:21,24 8:5	41:2,4 42:7	68:7
head	34:5 64:7	9:21 11:21	47:21 50:21	individual 40:7
	64:7,19,19	12:18 15:19	52:24 53:9,24	40:11 46:17
heads	19:22	16:17 17:2,3	60:10 66:5	individually
	23:8	19:6 20:8 21:6	identify 16:2	30:7
hear	6:10,17	22:13,15 26:20	48:12	individuals
	16:19,23 22:11	29:15 30:24		42:2,14,17
	26:17 27:22			

[individuals - late]

Page 12

45:6 49:4 51:8 53:3,12 industry 23:12 inform 27:3 67:9 70:2 information 22:7 23:5,7 28:14 40:11,22 41:3 48:14,17 53:5,11,18 54:3 55:16 56:10 57:18,20 60:6,23 61:16 62:2,5,19 63:17 64:18,24 66:12 67:20 69:13 infringement 33:15 34:12 37:3 64:1 initial 42:14 55:11 initially 43:19 inopportune 19:24 20:7 inquiry 16:15 inspected 28:16 intelligently 22:8 intend 65:9 intensive 44:2 interactions 34:21 interest 19:7	interested 72:15 73:12 interim 15:17 20:23 24:12,15 interrupt 7:12 introduce 5:23 invention 54:2 56:6,6 62:2 inventions 53:6 inventor 42:24 inventor's 54:8 inventors 42:1 42:4 43:6 53:1 53:2 54:7,14 54:19 57:17,18 61:12,14 62:3 62:16 investigation 32:24 involved 40:19 48:4 issue 16:19 17:4,20 22:12 23:20 26:13,16 26:21 29:8 34:2 37:10 39:15,16 40:9 40:10 41:17 45:9 46:11 48:9 53:1 56:12 61:3 62:12,14 64:10 64:24 65:19 67:5 69:22 70:14	issued 8:17 9:14 issues 6:8,11 12:19 16:2 23:19 42:19 44:1,2 48:18 59:8 60:17 62:4,6 66:8 70:4,18,18,21 j j 1:14 january 15:24 jbenassi 2:8 jeopardized 64:2 job 1:19 jodi 2:3 5:17 6:22 judge 68:6 july 8:7,17 55:9 june 8:10,13 18:12 55:8 k keep 31:1 63:13 keeping 68:7 kevin 40:4 key 17:3 kind 28:2 31:16 king 1:15 know 5:22 7:13 7:19 10:15 12:22 13:8 15:21,21,22 16:7,8 19:13	24:12,22 25:13 25:14,21 27:16 27:19 30:4,11 31:3,5,15,23 32:23 35:3,8 39:20 40:22,22 43:11,16,23 44:1 45:7 46:11 47:6 49:16,16 51:8 51:19 52:16,18 52:19 53:13 54:24 55:20 56:8,17,18 57:2,2 58:6,8 58:23 62:11 63:17 64:2 65:10 66:17 67:5,6,7,23 69:24 70:1,15 knowing 21:16 knowledge 41:5 50:18,21 50:23 72:10 73:6 known 49:3 61:22 knows 58:14,15 l lacked 41:18 laptop 37:7 large 19:23 23:3 50:2 53:8 late 5:6 7:24 19:12 20:3
--	--	--	---

[law - matters]

Page 13

law 47:11	lingers 26:16	38:23 39:10	maintaining
lead 10:24	list 41:21 44:4	looked 23:10	67:18
leaning 31:24	55:22 56:2,5	29:4 32:7	maintains
learn 56:23	63:10	38:14 53:2,3	60:23
learned 42:4	listed 40:1	looking 13:13	majority 55:5
52:4 56:24	42:14 43:6	30:14,21 32:24	56:22
led 56:6	44:7,8,8 48:23	36:10 40:11	make 7:14 10:1
left 15:6 39:21	48:24 49:4	62:4	31:17 36:19
39:21	56:9,20 57:14	looks 45:10	37:23 54:12
legal 10:4	listening 61:8	loose 25:13	57:5,6 59:12
length 25:22	lists 43:19	26:7	68:9
letter 12:9,12	literally 54:2	los 2:15	makes 47:9
12:14 13:24	litigate 65:22	loses 64:19	making 13:4
14:5 21:23	litigated 66:3	losing 43:18	20:14 33:8
22:23 27:1	litigating 66:7	lost 51:5 64:9,9	51:2 64:7
34:6 56:9 70:2	67:7	64:13	management
level 23:11	litigation 15:18	loughmiller	57:14 63:18
light 9:17 20:6	19:15,17 20:7	27:9 28:9,20	68:14
likelihood 66:7	24:24 25:1,3	30:4 39:1	manager 29:14
likely 37:20	29:8 36:12	loughmiller's	34:10 37:1,2,7
46:19 48:8	46:24 49:18	27:24	manners 67:7
51:12 53:4	56:12,19 65:20	 m	manuals 35:22
limit 33:19	68:2 70:10,19	machine 28:18	margins 60:20
63:11 65:2,3	little 8:17 18:16	29:11	mark 39:22
limitation 32:6	36:15,17 38:2	made 7:3 9:17	48:14
33:19 38:22	41:12,14	13:9 20:17	marked 4:4,8
limited 9:9 33:1	llp 2:5 3:4	22:23 34:4	market 3:6
36:4 40:21	locate 28:18	38:20 50:2	marketing
41:2,9 51:19	located 27:20	55:1,22 66:11	37:23 51:10,17
52:11 61:14	location 1:14	magic 65:5	51:22
limiting 32:14	locations 53:17	main 27:18	materials 6:6
limits 32:16	54:3	35:3 54:1	matter 5:3 11:1
line 5:16,21,23	look 8:4 18:4	maintain 53:8	40:24 54:9
12:12 46:4	21:16 23:5	maintained	matters 5:10
63:16	29:19 31:23	27:12 68:12	10:5 24:23

[matters - nuances]

Page 14

52:14 70:5 mcdermott 2:5 5:15 6:22 mean 13:4 14:9 19:14 31:14 44:4 56:12,15 58:13 64:14 meaningful 28:16 29:24 66:20 measuring 56:14 meet 23:1 44:23 66:20 memorializing 68:23 memory 12:13 48:19 mention 18:9 69:10 mentioned 8:3 21:22 66:5,23 mere 47:20 merely 48:16 merger 47:24 met 17:20 mid 24:20 45:12 50:3 52:5 middle 14:22 21:12 minimum 59:2 minor 68:9 minutes 39:21 39:24 57:7	misinterpreting 27:23 misleading 58:4 missed 39:5 48:14,23 63:1 65:6 misses 61:10 missing 14:1 29:2 36:23 43:18 63:6 mission 2:6 mistaken 14:14 misunderstan... 34:17 mitigating 13:20 moment 14:3 month 8:18 10:7,23 12:2 14:18 15:10 21:19 42:21 52:5 54:20 62:12 monthly 60:21 months 10:4 14:14 17:7,15 18:23 54:23 67:9 motion 6:12,13 23:21 26:11 37:10 38:11 55:1 67:12 69:12,15	move 10:21 23:19 26:10 39:15 46:19 moving 10:10 multiple 37:17 50:17 58:3 mwe.com 2:8 n n 2:1 3:1 5:1 name 30:5 50:17,23 58:3 named 52:24 names 41:4 45:5,6 51:7 54:9 61:19 nature 24:24 25:3 near 9:6 neatly 30:14 necessarily 47:2 55:4 necessity 25:11 need 5:7 13:19 16:10 21:21 23:19 32:21 33:18 34:12 38:2 56:4 70:2 needed 11:17 16:12 25:5,23 29:22 34:11 68:9 needs 18:17 24:17 35:5 69:3 70:21	neither 72:11 73:7 never 29:4 30:1 36:11,13 43:10 45:8 57:11 67:22 new 59:9 nice 43:12 nick 53:22 nikolov 57:22 nine 42:3 44:7 56:20,22 non 25:2 56:10 north 1:15 3:6 notary 72:19 note 60:24 noted 32:13 notice 7:11 8:2 8:7,17 9:14 11:12 20:17 47:8 57:10 noticing 47:7 notification 20:11 notifying 20:12 november 1:11 7:21 10:2,22 11:3,9,13 15:8 15:8,10 17:12 43:1 58:24 nuance 10:9 44:13 55:11 58:1 nuances 14:16
---	--	---	---

[number - people]

Page 15

number	5:3 50:19 61:14 65:5	onedrive	53:21	own	7:1 17:8 64:17		19:15 23:1 42:12 46:5,5
numbers	45:16	opening	12:15	p			49:11 52:6
numerous	36:2	opens	68:4	p	2:1,1 3:1,1 5:1		58:23 59:16
		operate	64:16	p.c.	2:13		65:10 68:3,6,8
		operates	35:21	p.m.	1:12 71:3		68:22 70:5
		operating	6:24 35:22	p27	61:1		72:12,14 73:8
		operation		packaged			73:11
		opportunities	34:19	pages	9:3	party	33:7 43:19,21 63:10
		opportunity	7:9 14:6 17:2 43:14 48:6	palapura	3:3 5:22,24 6:1	pass	25:12
		opposed	51:22	papers	26:15 35:23	past	7:3 31:5 32:14,16,21
		opposition	21:22	paragraph			39:22 66:10
		oral	26:15		40:17 41:13 42:7 45:3,5	patent	26:22 32:9,10 33:12
		order	7:4 12:17 26:15 39:9 49:24 68:23 69:22		46:2 49:4 52:7 52:23 53:10 56:2 57:10,17 61:19		33:13,20 36:12 46:24 53:1,2,3 53:6,7 54:2,4 55:12,14 56:7 57:19,20 64:17
		original	41:21 59:17	paramount	68:13	pennsylvania	72:20
		originally	42:7 67:10	part	13:16 27:1 30:12 34:17 40:9,9	pennypack	6:18 13:14 19:4 23:24 24:3
		outcome	72:16 73:12	partially	68:21	people	34:19 44:24 45:3 48:24 53:4
		outlines	14:24	particular	36:4 40:21 63:15,16 67:22		56:10 61:15,20 62:1,15,18 64:23
		outside	65:20 66:15	particularly	51:13 68:2		
		overall	40:20	parties	10:1,10 13:6 18:20		
		overlooked	12:10 31:22 39:5				

[percent - produced]

Page 16

percent	7:5,17 7:23 18:10 50:8	32:3,6,15 33:21 36:9 38:1,6 39:18	privilege 18:2 23:7,15 privileged 19:13 22:22 23:13,17 privy 35:15 probably 58:9 problem 21:11 25:15,15 57:3 63:2 67:8 procedure 62:10 65:11 proceeding 11:12 71:4 73:4 proceedings 72:3,5,6,9 73:6 process 30:11 49:11,15 produce 18:5 23:3,6 27:13 31:17 32:19,21 36:6 43:12 44:5 45:18 52:20 60:21,22 61:11 67:13 69:21 produced 6:15 7:6,19 8:9,13 8:15 9:18 10:16 12:20 18:7,10,13 19:12,12,19,20 19:20 23:22 25:7 27:5
perform	28:15	54:11,20 55:20	
perifery	46:18	58:1 61:10,10	
period	18:11 56:24	62:17	
permission	5:19	points 27:22 policy 58:6,7 portion 8:23,23 position 16:14 21:4 24:15 56:17 65:4	
person	27:17 27:19 30:9	possession 17:6 possible 16:4 35:12 38:5 possibly 45:16 potential 34:19 34:21 47:24	
persons	41:5	potentially 16:3 35:18 potter 3:4 6:1	
persuade	38:7	potteranderson... 3:8	
pertinent	48:10	practically 15:10	
ph	26:1 45:23 61:1	practice 51:3 64:17	
phase	68:5,18	practices 68:14	
picking	65:18	precisely 7:14	
piece	29:7 64:20	precluding 6:14 15:17	
pieces	29:7,10	23:21 24:10	
place	43:22 69:12	preclusion 13:16	
plaintiff	1:5 2:2 4:3 5:12,16 6:23 24:21 69:2		
plan	30:7		
platform	34:10		
plaza	3:5		
please	12:10 34:13 61:6		
plus	17:15		
point	10:9,21 25:20 30:24		

[produced - received]

Page 17

28:15 32:4,12	51:3 64:7,16	puts 63:11	rather 19:23
35:19,23 36:5	profits 51:5	q	rationale 68:24
37:20 38:15	64:9	qualified 72:7	reach 66:20
39:5,8 45:7,20	promptly 69:1	qualify 45:3	reached 54:12
45:24 54:4,10	pronounce	question 16:11	read 6:6 7:16
55:6,8,13,17,21	30:5	20:21 21:21	reading 27:24
56:7 57:1 60:8	properties 35:5	22:19 40:5	ready 14:20
60:19 61:20	propose 21:3	51:24 57:5,24	15:4 20:15
producing	proposed 50:12	questioned	26:10
12:15 20:2,3,3	54:21 56:9	18:24 22:4	real 69:24
55:19	57:19 59:14,19	67:18	realize 52:19
product 27:18	60:7	questioning	realized 18:3
29:17 32:8	proposing 63:4	21:10	20:13 23:5
34:23 35:21	provide 8:6	questions 14:8	really 11:9
37:5 40:8,13	20:16 23:9	17:11 19:7	18:17 23:9
40:21 50:24	27:6 36:7	21:23 27:22	34:5 37:10,11
51:1,3,4,18	provided 8:6	36:20 37:12	39:21,24 41:6
55:16 57:13,14	26:23 57:23	39:24 50:19	52:3 62:14,17
58:14,15 60:10	60:15 69:13	58:5,12,14	62:24 66:19
63:16 64:8	public 72:19	quickly 10:13	reason 31:13
production	publications	58:13	33:6 39:6
7:18,20,24,24	23:12	quite 47:19	reasonable
8:9 9:2,5 20:16	purchasing	r	38:3 65:16
20:17 25:5,8	34:23	r 2:1 3:1 5:1	reasons 10:3
26:12,18 35:20	pure 51:16	r&d 60:20	22:24
38:11 50:3,6,9	purposes 9:11	raise 70:14,20	rebuttal 15:22
51:20 61:4	47:10	raised 17:19	15:23 16:4,6
62:9 63:23	pursue 42:9	ramped 14:19	17:18 21:3
64:15	push 10:2,6	ran 44:18	60:4
productions	pushed 10:3	49:19 50:1	recall 48:3,4
7:3,5,8 8:10	pushing 59:4	53:18 55:13	49:21 53:12
10:14 15:1	put 29:3,12,13	59:16,20,21	receive 69:20
20:9 55:24	29:16 54:7	range 25:24	received 40:23
products 26:22	55:22 69:15		41:10 50:5
32:11 33:3,12			51:19 69:19

[recently - response]

Page 18

recently	42:3	39:4 48:9 51:9	63:5	request	28:2
recognize		53:5 54:3 56:6	remember	36:2 39:13	
24:20 70:12		57:18,20 58:5	31:11 48:19	40:10 54:13	
record	14:1	58:12 64:10,11	remembered	55:12 59:9	
17:5,16 22:2		relative 72:13	31:8	requested	26:3
22:16 24:2		73:10	remembering	requests	55:15
25:19 38:20		release 26:3	62:20	requirement	
39:13 63:22		releases 23:13	remembers	27:10 28:9	
65:15 66:1,11		relevance	31:12	requires	43:21
67:12 68:20		47:20	repeatedly	47:16	
69:16 72:9		relevant 26:12	28:10 36:5	reside	34:7
73:5		26:18 38:12	41:4	resolution	
recorded	72:6	39:7,11 44:5,9	replacement	66:21	
recording	72:8	44:20 46:19	39:16 40:2	resolve	67:5
73:4		48:10,13,18	44:10 48:13	resolved	6:9,11
records	47:9,17	50:15 53:12,17	50:12 65:17	49:20 61:1	
59:9		55:5 56:11	67:14	63:3 68:15	
reduced	72:7	61:21 62:5,19	replacing	69:22 70:5,16	
referred	27:17	63:1,17 65:6	report	12:15	
reflects	17:5	relief 6:14,19	16:4,6 17:18	resolving	59:8
refused	10:20	16:13 20:23	reported	1:18	
refuting	41:6	21:5 23:21	reports	11:5,8	
regard	44:1	24:1,4,10 25:6	15:23,23 21:3	42:23 48:15	
regarding		25:14,16 26:4	21:12,14	50:16,21 52:23	
69:10		46:15	repositories	54:11,23 56:8	
rein	26:7	rely 42:13	57:21 58:12		
reiterate	52:3	54:15	49:14 53:20		
60:5		relying 6:14	60:14	60:9,18 61:10	
related	16:12	23:22	repository	66:5 69:17	
25:2 31:2 34:9		remainder	70:4,9		
55:12,14 58:6		15:18	respond	16:14	
58:7 64:24		remedies 24:8	28:7		
72:11 73:7		remedy 15:17	response	7:16	
relating	26:22	17:21 22:7	31:2,13 34:12		
28:2 31:21		24:12,15 36:24	38:13 47:8		
			represented 7:5	57:4,6	
			43:7		

[responses - scope]

Page 19

responses	29:15,21 33:23	35:13,17 37:18	39:18 40:2
57:23 60:16	34:1 37:14	39:10	41:19 42:8
responsive	34:6	salesperson	43:14 46:12
34:7,9 38:15	38:10 41:11	35:14	47:24 48:2,2,3
54:5	59:24 60:3	san 2:7 5:17	49:17,19 52:1
rest	61:5 69:7	sanction 19:2	54:12,13,18,20
13:22	role 43:21	sansymphony	55:15 56:9,17
16:21	rolling 19:20	40:8,12 50:22	57:10 59:3,4
result	20:4,9,17	51:1,9 55:16	60:4,14 61:2,6
results	room 1:16	58:12 60:9,13	62:21 64:8
retention	2:13 6:3	santos 73:2,15	65:17 66:21
58:7	roughly 8:17	satisfied 38:13	69:8
returned	41:14	39:6 65:15	scale's 7:9 8:8
revenue	rule 42:15 44:9	saw 40:15	9:22 10:11
review	47:7 65:3 70:6	saying 13:7	14:7 21:4
7:9 13:1	ruled 7:22	25:19 26:2,3	25:12 27:10
14:20 15:14	49:23	49:2 55:3,4	28:16 32:17
20:24 22:18,20	rules 7:3 49:22	61:15,18 62:3	34:8,23 38:13
24:17 28:13,16	65:9	65:6 68:1	39:16 43:19
29:1,24 32:23	ruling 57:6	says 28:3 44:10	45:21 46:14
36:14,23	rulings 68:19	scale 1:7 2:11	54:13 55:11
reviewed	68:24 70:11	3:2 5:3,21 6:2	63:24 65:21
17:14 18:23	run 35:11	6:14,24 7:11	schedule 7:2
22:3,17 37:5,6	45:16 48:7	7:16 10:19	13:23 21:13
reviewer	59:2,13 67:1	12:21 13:8	26:1 68:12
reviewers	running 52:11	16:19,24 21:19	70:8 71:1
reviewing	59:2	22:23 23:2,4	scheduled 9:23
11:10 20:14		23:14,22 27:4	schedules
41:20	s	27:13,22,22	68:10
rewind	s 2:1 3:1 4:1 5:1	28:3,6,15,17	scheduling 7:4
rfps	sales 34:15,18	29:2 30:4,16	12:17
right	34:19 35:10	31:13,17 32:7	scientific 30:17
5:2 8:24	37:23 51:18	33:1 34:2,3	scope 16:11
9:20,21 10:7	64:9,12,19	36:23 37:17	25:21 63:18
11:19,23 15:23	salesforce	38:4,21 39:9	
16:9,18 18:5	27:12 34:8,15		
20:22 22:10,14	34:18 35:5,11		
23:18 27:19			

[scrambling - sort]

Page 20

scrambling	seeking	sheets	single
9:24	6:20 16:13 22:8	45:22 sherry 1:13	15:9 sites 53:20
scribe	39:16 40:2	shield 32:17	six 32:14,17,21
29:13 31:2	46:15	shoes 62:16	33:9,19 38:21
34:9	seeks 28:5	short 15:17	52:24 54:14
search	38:18	36:18 37:12	size 9:6
33:9 35:11,11 38:4	seemed 17:9	69:21	skills 72:10
39:17 44:16,19	70:15	shortage 35:20	73:6
44:21,22 45:16	seems 18:15	shortly 13:10	slightly 7:19
47:10 48:7	40:7	shot 26:8	41:1 66:13
49:5,7,12,13,20	seen 28:22 31:7	show 14:1	slip 45:22
49:22 50:1,1	36:13 40:1	46:14	slots 61:19
53:18 55:13	selecting 66:14	showing 13:4,6	small 45:2
59:2,6,9,15,20	sends 35:14	24:3 38:3	51:20
60:13 65:2,20	senior 30:5	shown 13:18	smaller 44:6
67:1,13	60:12	shows 17:16	software 1:4
searched	sense 37:23	48:17	2:2 27:4,7
35:7,9 44:17 47:5	59:5 67:2	side 35:24	28:16 29:7,8
54:8 59:10	september 7:21	43:24 51:10,17	29:10,17 35:6
65:1 67:23	8:22 9:6,23	51:21,22,24	51:21 60:11,12
searching	10:10,12,18	66:18 70:20	sold 60:20
49:15 51:11	14:13,18,21	side's 47:12	solution 65:24
63:13,14,14	15:5 20:10,10	signature 72:17	solve 57:3
second	24:20	73:14	somebody
7:11 10:19 22:21	serve 68:20	significance	31:22 50:23
23:10 55:15	served 7:10 8:2	50:14	sonsini 2:13 6:3
see	21:14 55:15	significant 8:23	soon 18:6 20:13
8:3 12:13 13:19 17:21	set 5:4,8 12:16	similar 19:18	49:13
18:21 19:3,6	32:18 33:6	26:13	sophisticated
33:2 34:5 41:5	41:9 55:15	simplistically	30:17
64:10,15,17	several 27:10	30:20	sorry 7:13
seeing	severely 12:23	simply 26:23	59:11
41:20	shape 12:15	36:8 62:7 65:1	sort 21:12 28:4
seek	shared 53:20	68:23	38:17
25:6,11,18 26:4 54:21	54:7		
60:6			

[sought - telling]

Page 21

sought	55:16	stated	23:4,14 27:1	subset	44:6	system	34:10
source	28:12,13 28:17 29:1,10 29:18,23,24 36:11,13,22	statements	60:19	substantial	6:19 8:12 18:12	t	
speak	58:21	states	1:1	substantive	57:23 58:11 60:16	t	4:1
specific	12:9 24:8 26:5 30:9 40:20 44:3	static	70:12	substitute	43:22	tailor	39:20
specifically	6:17 21:16 25:6 34:3,9 40:16 50:22	stating	28:21	sufficient	26:24 28:14 65:16	tailored	25:14 25:17
speculating	35:8	staying	68:11	suggested	20:23	take	16:3 42:18 42:19
spend	36:13	steps	67:9	suite	2:6	taken	11:15,17 12:2,4 43:1 67:9,17 68:17 72:3,12 73:9
spent	36:10,16	stick	56:14	summary	23:24	talin	2:12 6:2
spirit	46:2,4	stipulated	42:12	supplemented	36:11,22	talk	43:15,16
spot	61:24	stop	9:8 19:6 20:20 36:19 37:11 52:13 65:11	supportive	67:19	talking	34:20 46:8
spread	25:1,1	stopped	29:12	supports	32:3	talks	31:5,8,12
srf	1:7	stops	48:19	sure	7:14,16 8:5 19:16 20:15 28:8	tangential	
stage	68:2	store	37:23	surprised	30:18 31:17 35:12 36:6,19 57:5 59:12	targeted	65:18
standard	32:14 32:16 33:5,8 33:10,17,19 38:22 43:24 46:5,6,10 65:8	stored	37:18 53:14 54:4	surprising	52:4	task	19:23
stars	2:14	story	7:15	surrounds	17:15 36:15	tasked	30:10
start	5:7,11 6:13 34:20	streamline	42:19	suspicious	40:9	team	10:5 14:19,21 15:6 19:16 30:6
started	46:15	street	1:15 2:6 3:6	sword	45:10	teams	25:1
state	32:20 37:16 69:18 72:20	structured	29:24	sworn	32:17	technical	48:3 51:10,21 60:12
		subject	54:9		72:5	technically	35:12 64:16
		submitted	6:7			teleconference	5:5,8 26:14
		subsequent	10:14 70:17			tell	20:5 66:19
		subsequently	29:3			telling	7:18,23

[temporal - triggers]

Page 22

temporal 32:6	theoretically	49:5 52:7,23	69:10,14 71:1
ten 44:8 52:7	11:24	53:10 54:16,23	today's 6:9
term 35:11	theory 35:22	56:2 57:11,17	15:20
terms 13:5,22	ther 64:14	61:19 63:9	told 28:17
13:22 14:4,16	thimble 40:4	tie 26:7 70:18	44:21 45:8
14:17 20:2,11	46:23 48:15	time 1:12 5:4	62:12
20:20,22 21:9	49:1 59:15	9:9,13,22 10:4	tomorrow 11:7
38:4 44:16,19	thin 25:1,1 66:1	12:1,19 15:2,3	11:19,22 12:4
48:7 49:7,12	thing 18:5 32:5	15:8,14 16:1	took 69:12
49:14,20,22	44:18,20 70:13	16:12,21 17:19	tool 34:15,18
50:1,2 53:18	things 31:14	19:7,9,16,24	topic 26:11
55:13 59:3,6	51:9,21 62:21	20:7 21:7 22:9	topics 16:11
59:16,20 61:4	69:24 70:13	22:22 25:14,23	25:22
67:1	think 6:8,8	29:10 32:8	total 7:6 40:23
testified 27:9	14:4 15:21	33:2 36:17,18	towards 31:24
27:11,15 30:6	16:1,2,10	37:3,6,13	townsend 2:4
37:17 47:23	18:17 21:11	39:20 52:11,11	5:13,14
testify 28:9	27:12 31:23	53:13 56:23	track 34:19
testifying 72:5	34:16 36:7	58:22,22 59:1	68:8,11
testimony 28:1	37:9,10 39:8	63:15 66:16	tracked 64:12
31:10,20 48:17	42:20 43:4	69:4,15,24	transcriber
51:7 67:21	44:18 47:11	70:24	73:1
69:11	48:22 50:14	timeframe	transcript
tethered 26:5	57:3 61:10	11:17 16:12	68:20 73:3,5
66:2	63:5 65:9,14	49:15	transcriptionist
thank 5:20 6:5	66:22 68:22	timeline 7:1	72:8
6:21 8:16	third 23:14	41:22 43:17	transcripts
16:22 17:2	thought 15:16	49:24	11:24 12:6
19:8 22:10,15	15:20 19:13	timely 55:17	38:24
23:17 26:20	53:4,10	times 36:2	trial 11:1 15:7
34:1 36:21	three 22:24	50:17 58:3	42:17 54:15
37:14 52:12,13	29:7,10 40:17	timing 14:16,17	68:8,12
52:14 57:9	41:13 42:6,7	tips 6:18	trials 10:5
61:7,8 69:5	42:11 44:8	today 5:18 6:2	triggers 44:10
70:23	45:2,4,5 46:3	22:1 68:15	47:9

[troubling - withheld]

Page 23

troubling	46:12	36:14,16 40:1	utilized	24:11	66:4
true	72:9 73:5	43:1,9,10		v	ways 66:6
truly	33:1 57:7	46:11 59:12	v	1:6	we've 15:13
try	62:1	understanding	vacuum	67:6	28:10 32:19
trying	29:19	7:14 10:3	vendor	20:15	35:19,23 36:1
	67:5	20:12 29:2	vetted	66:17	36:5 40:22
turn	12:24 15:2	30:19,22 41:16	vice	57:13	41:3,10 42:3
	43:20	44:16 52:6		60:10	42:20 51:19
turns	44:8	understood	videoconfere...	52:10 54:4	52:10 54:4
	56:21 67:21	18:6 37:19	1:10 2:3,4,12	wearer	1:18
tweak	58:18	42:22 62:10	3:3	72:2,18	
two	6:8 10:4,14	unfortunately	view	website 45:22	
	14:14,24 15:24	22:6	8:24 39:8	wednesday	
	17:7,15,15	unit	68:16	1:11	
	18:8,23 20:9	united	void	week 15:22,24	
	29:17 39:21	units	volume	weeks 18:8	
	46:21,23 50:9	universe	23:3	50:9	
	50:12 63:9	59:23	63:18	weigh 24:1,3	
	65:18 66:14	67:2	vs	66:13	
tying	65:19	unrelated	5:3	weighing	6:18
type	37:19	10:5	want	went 15:7 23:4	
	41:18	18:16 46:18	7:14 8:1	28:13 29:4,9	
types	35:17,19	untimely	32:15 36:19	33:1 44:15	
	59:8 66:8	7:8,24	51:24 57:5	49:11	
typewriting	72:7	8:23	61:11	white 13:14	
		update	wanted	35:23	
		56:2,5	20:21	williams 68:7	
		updated	49:21 54:12	wilmington	
		43:10	69:15,18	1:17 3:7	
		upend	wants	wilson 2:13 6:3	
		21:13	33:7	wishes 63:10	
		upending	34:8	withdrawn	
		13:22	warning	42:8	
		use	10:15	withheld 18:2,3	
		15:17	warranted	18:7 23:15	
		used	19:4		
		34:18	24:11		
		useful	way		
		9:19	12:15		
		user	13:11 40:8		
		37:22,22	46:13 59:24		
		users	62:8,11 65:7		
		27:5			
		using			
		32:17			
		59:15			
		usually			
		68:19			

[withholding - zero]

Page 24

withholding	wrote 54:7
36:1	x
witness 9:20	x 4:1
11:21 25:19,23	y
40:17 47:15,15	y 40:6
47:21 67:22	yeah 13:3
72:4	23:17 29:21
witnesses 10:20	12:1 14:8,23
	44:3 46:8
	15:13 17:11
	52:22 54:24
	18:1,24 21:9
	56:13
	21:19,21,24
	year 33:19
	22:5,19 25:12
	38:21 41:14
	27:11 37:17
	55:23
	38:24 46:16,23
	years 32:14,17
	47:1,1,3,7
	32:22 33:9
	48:16 51:8
	36:12 53:8
	z
	zabrowski 40:4
	46:23 48:15
	59:15 62:20
	69:11
woefully 63:23	zabrowski's
64:15	47:19 48:7
words 22:11	zero 15:14
25:9 61:6	
working 10:12	
worthwhile	
64:3	
wound 14:21	
wrapping 9:17	
write 11:4	
writers 30:11	
30:12	
writing 70:1	
written 27:5,6	
68:23	